



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION. III. GEN. 37:2-EX. 12:51.

BY PROFESSOR W. HENRY GREEN,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

B. Ex. 1:1-12:51.

SECTION XIII. EX. 1:1-7:7.

The Divine Names.

Elohim and Jehovah are here used with the same discrimination that we have found to characterize their employment throughout the Book of Genesis. Elohim is appropriate 1:17,21 in the phrase "feared God" as a general term for piety, compare Gen. 20:11; 22:12, the article being added **האלהים** as Gen. 24:18, to indicate that this pious fear was directed to the true God; 1:20 of providential benefits; 2:23-25 where the contrast is between human oppressors of Israel and God who espoused their cause; 3:1 and 4:27 the mountain of God as the scene of a divine revelation, compare 18:6; 4:16 and 7:1 Moses is instead of God as an organ of divine communication; 4:20 the rod of God as an instrument of divine power, compare 17:9. In ch. 3 God reveals himself to Moses as Jehovah, and during this interview the two names are interchangeably employed; thenceforth Jehovah is regularly used (with the exceptions above mentioned, which are for special reasons) until 6:2,3, where God again makes himself known as Jehovah, promising to Moses in his despondency such a manifestation of what this name involved as had never been witnessed before.

A. The Portion Assigned to J.

The bulk of the narrative is as in Genesis given to JE, and the attempt is made to bridge the chasm thus created and produce the semblance of continuity for P by arbitrarily assigning to it a few scattered verses, sundered from their proper connection. In all this the critics repeatedly set at naught their own criteria as well as violate the evident proprieties of the case. The alleged peculiarities of language, style, material and theology are purely fictitious, resulting directly from the division made in this closely connected and regularly unfolding narrative, and do not in any way suggest diversity of authorship.

1. Chapter 1:1-5, 7, 13, 14.

The list of Jacob's sons 1:1-5 is a brief recapitulation of the more detailed account, Gen. 46:8-27, some of whose peculiar expressions it retains, while never-

theless the order of the names is modified into conformity with the like list, Gen. 35:23-26. By almost unanimous critical consent these three enumerations are alike referred to P, which is an admission that the same writer may have occasion to repeat statements before made; and that such repetitions may be no indication of distinct sources. And even though with Kayser, Gen. 46:8-27 and Ex. 1:5a be imputed to R to escape critical embarrassments (which others try to evade by claiming that Gen. 46:8 sqq. has been worked over by R), the identity of Gen. 35:23 sqq. and Ex. 1:1-4,5b remains. Knobel claims Ex. 1:6 for P along with the rest of the paragraph, vs. 1-7, to which it belongs; but as this verse manifestly prepares the way for vs. 8 sqq., the majority of critics cut it out of its connection and attribute it to E, notwithstanding the fact that a previous record of the death of Joseph is also ascribed to him, Gen. 50:26. Verse 7 is also given to P, though he is reputed to have already stated the vast multiplication of the children of Israel in Egypt, Gen. 47:27. And yet immediately after having thus three times in succession referred two statements of the same thing to one writer, the critics gravely affirm that 1:12a is a doublet of 1:7 and 1:11 of vs. 13,14 (HEBRAICA, VI., p. 27), and must consequently be traced to different documents, though each verse is precisely in place in the plan of this admirably constructed chapter.

The enormous increase of the Israelites is depicted 1:7 by heaping together four synonymous verbs, and adding a duplicated intensive adverb. The critics have taken offence at this unusual combination, which is plainly due to the effort to give adequate expression to this most extraordinary case. Nöldeke would erase ויעצמו. וישרצו. Wellhausen and Dillmann וירבו ויעצמו only, as

insertions from a parallel narrative. But פרה, רבה, שרץ and עצם are combined in P, Gen. 8:17; 9:7. The verb עצם occurs but once in the Pentateuch outside of this chapter, viz., Gen. 26:16, J; so, as Jülicher confesses, there is no reason why it should not here belong to P. רב and עצם are joined together, Num. 32:1a P, and nowhere else in the Pentateuch except in this chapter and in Deuteronomy.

The immense number of Israelites, v. 7, is in obvious contrast to their fewness when they entered Egypt, vs. 1-5, and is the necessary explanation of all that follows, vs. 8-22, the perplexity of the king of Egypt and the stern measures adopted for their repression. The very words of v. 7 are alluded to v. 9 (רב) and v. 20 (וירבו ויעצמו מאד). The whole chapter is thus solidly bound together, and no room left for the critical assumption that this latter portion is from a different document.

Four measures of growing severity were successively employed to oppress the Israelites and reduce their strength. 1. Taskmasters were set over them, v. 11. 2. As this proved abortive, v. 12, their bondage was intensified, and they were made to serve with rigor, vs. 13,14. 3. The midwives were commanded to destroy the male children of the Hebrews, vs. 15,16. 4. As this did not succeed, vs. 17-21, a like command was given by Pharaoh to all his people, v. 22. The regular progression in these cruel expedients shows that they form a continuous series. The

critics, however, sunder out one of the number and arbitrarily assign it to a different document from the rest. The allegation, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 28, that "1:13 sq. would logically come before 1:11" is a mistake, since the expressions of the former are more intense and so mark a more advanced stage. However "absurd" it may have been "for them to try the same means again," which had failed before, it is just what persecutors have always done. Why "in this case there would be no ground left for the command to destroy the infants" it is hard to see; after exhausting other expedients the king resorts to this barbarous measure. Verses 13,14 are, moreover, equally bound to the different documents, to P by "rigor" twice פֶּרֶךְ in Pentateuch besides only Lev. 25:43,46,53, to J by "made bitter" וַיַּמְרֵר in Pentateuch only besides Gen. 49:23, while "in brick" plainly points forward to the narrative Ex. 5:7 sqq. J (Well.) E (Dill.), an allusion which the critics seek to evade by erasing the unwelcome word with its adjuncts.

2. Chapter 2:23b-25.

The entire narrative between 1:14 and 6:2 is given by the critics to J or E and a shift made to fill the resulting gap in P by assigning to it 2:23b-25, though these verses are indispensable in the connection in which they stand and it is not even pretended that they contain a single word characteristic of P. And "the covenant with Isaac" is a clear reference to J, Gen. 26:2-5.24; no such covenant is mentioned in any passage assigned by the critics to P. אֱלֹהִים affords no ground for division, since that is the only name of God which has thus far occurred in Exodus.

The suggestion, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 28, that 2:23a "is out of place," is entirely unfounded. It "does mean that the new king (of 1:8), the severe king died," and cannot mean anything else. But it is neither said nor implied that "the children of Israel groaned over it;" they sighed by reason of the bondage, which did not terminate with his death. Verses 23-25 are preliminary to God's revelation of himself to Moses, ch. 3, and commissioning him to deliver Israel. Two facts are stated to prepare the way for what is to follow. 1. The king of Egypt was dead: it was hence a favorable juncture for Moses to return and espouse the cause of Israel, cf. 4:19. 2. God heard the groans of Israel and remembered his covenant with their fathers; it may consequently be expected that he would interfere on their behalf. With explicit reference to the language here used God reveals himself to Moses, 3:6, and through him to the people, 3:15, 16, as the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, cf. 2:24. He adds, v. 7, "I have surely seen" (cf. 2:25 וִירָא), "and have heard their cry" (צַעֲקָתָם שְׁמַעְתִּי, cf. 2:24 וַיִּשְׁמַע; v. 23 וַיַּזְעִקוּ). "I know" (cf. 2:25 וַיֵּדַע)* v. 9, "the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me," cf. 2:23. If these verses are

* In consequence of the coincidences in expression between 2:25 and 3:7, Jülicher feels constrained to refer the former not to P but to R.

assigned to a different document from ch. 3, then God speaks in the latter of having heard his people's cry, and yet there is no previous mention of their having cried to him.

3. Chapter 6:2-7:7.

From 2:25 the critics spring at once to 6:2, claiming that this is the true original connection in P, and that all that intervenes is from another source. This is urged upon the following grounds:

1. If 6:2 be joined directly with 2:25, the narrative will be continuous and the sense perfect.

2. 6:2 sqq. is full of references to 2:23-25, showing their intimate mutual relation.

3. 6:2-7:7 is a parallel and independent account of what had already been fully and somewhat variously related before.

4. The representation made in this section differs from that previously given in certain striking and characteristic particulars.

But these arguments do not prove what they are adduced to prove.

As to the first point, the seeming continuity of the narrative, if 3:1-6:1 be omitted.

(1) This is very far from showing that 2:25 was originally connected with 6:2. Distant paragraphs can often be fitted to one another by a little ingenuity so that a reader would not be aware that they did not belong together. This is especially the case with paragraphs, which, as in the present instance, record successive stages in the same transaction.

(2) The connection is perfectly good as the section now stands; there is no incongruity or want of appropriateness in its present position and no reason for seeking to attach it elsewhere.

(3) Moses is suddenly introduced 6:2, and Aaron 6:13, with no previous intimation of their existence and no explanation who they were. This incongruity created by the removal of the very account (ch. 2 sqq.) here presupposed, gives rise to new critical assumptions. Kuenen fancies that P had spoken of Moses and Aaron in some passage which has not been preserved. Kayser gets rid of the allusion to Aaron by referring 6:13-30 to R. Dillmann declines to do this, but with a like view of finding the first mention of Aaron in 7:1 he transposes 6:30-7:5 before 6:13 and places 7:6 immediately after it. Wellhausen undertakes to supply the missing mention of Moses and Aaron by the conjecture that the account of their ancestry (6:16 sqq.) may originally have preceded 6:2, while in its present position and extent as including Aaron's wife and children (vs. 23 sqq.) the genealogy is in his judgment inappropriate and a later addition. The allegation, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 27, "P knows nothing of Moses' marriage, though mentioning the wives of Aaron and Eleazar," is simply a reluctant confession that this table of lineage intentionally omits what had already been recorded, 2:21,

thus proving itself to be of one piece with the antecedent history. The appositeness of the entire genealogy, every clause of which is in analogy with those previously given, further appears from the fact that it not only introduces Aaron and Moses, who are just entering upon the momentous task assigned them, but likewise Korah, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, Ithamar, and Phinehas, who are to figure in the subsequent history. This is in precise accordance with the invariable usage of the Pentateuch from the beginning, in which the line of descent of all the prominent actors is scrupulously traced. Nöldeke confesses the suitability of the table in general, but stumbles at the sons of Reuben and Simeon (vs. 14,15) as here uncalled for, and in his opinion an interpolation. Jülicher very properly replies that an interpolator would not have stopped with inserting these two names only, when there was an equal reason for adding all the rest of Jacob's sons. In fact there is a suitability in vs. 14,15 standing where they do to indicate Levi's place as the third in age in his father's family, as is conceded, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 27. Jülicher proposes to relieve the suddenness of the mention of Moses in 6:2 by transposing before it the entire genealogy with 6:13 as its title, which will thus connect directly with 2:25; although this would place "Jehovah" in 6:13 prior to what he considers the first revelation of this name in 6:2,3. But after all this self-imposed trouble and these fruitless conjectures of the critics, it is difficult to see why the reasons, be they what they may, which led an imaginary R to give to this whole passage its present position, may not have been equally influential with the original writer. This busy tinkering merely betokens a weak spot, which needs in some way to be covered up.

As to the second critical allegation that 6:2 sqq. contain several verbal allusions to 2:23-25, it is freely admitted that God's hearing the groaning of the children of Israel and remembering his covenant, and the bondage, 6:5 refer to 2:23, 24. This shows that these passages are in intimate and designed relation to each other, but not that they were continuous. The language of 6:2-4 is still more closely conformed to that of Genesis, ch. 17, to which there is explicit reference and repeated verbal correspondence; but it does not follow from this that they belong in immediate juxtaposition or that violent critical methods are to be resorted to with the view of bringing this about.

The third allegation of the critics that 6:2 sqq. is a parallel account of the same transaction already recorded 3:1 sqq., is assumed not only without proof but in defiance of clear proof to the contrary. And this baseless assumption is the principal ground of the partitions here made.

(1) It is universally confessed that the connection in which this paragraph now stands and the manner in which it is related show that the author of the book understood this to be a distinct event from any that had been narrated before, and intended that it should be so regarded by his readers. The critics are consequently obliged to assume that R with all the sources in their primitive form

before him held this view which they are able to correct with simply the materials which he has left them.

(2) There are certain features of resemblance between the two transactions, but the time, place and attendant circumstances are different. Here the critics most unwarrantably urge the points in common in proof that they are the same event, and then parade the points of disagreement in evidence that these are variant and inconsistent accounts from different writers, who followed distinct traditions. In reality they only succeed thus in overthrowing their own argument. The discrepancies simply show that the events are, as the writer himself believed and represented, separate occurrences. And the respects, in which they agree, are such as might easily be repeated on successive occasions. It is neither inconceivable nor improbable that God should repeat to Moses, when dejected by the ill success of his first application to Pharaoh, the same assurances that had been given him when first called to this work, that he would make himself known to them as Jehovah, and fulfil the covenant made with their fathers and bring them out of the bondage of Egypt to the land of Canaan. On the contrary this is the most natural thing in the world, and just what might be expected under the circumstances. That he should repeat this to the people, 6:9, and that Aaron who had been made his spokesman unto the people, 4:16, should now be appointed his coadjutor before Pharaoh, 7:1,2 is also a matter of course. All this warrants no suspicion that there is here a fresh recital of what had been related before. Any history whatever could be discredited and endless confusion introduced into it, if on the ground of superficial resemblances distinct events were thus to be identified.

The fourth critical argument from the diversity of representation in this and the preceding section has already been substantially answered so far as statements of facts are concerned, by showing that it indicates not difference of authorship but a difference in the events recorded.

(1) The critics will have it that according to P, God's first revelation to Moses of his purpose to deliver Israel was made not in Midian, nor in the wilderness, but in Egypt, 6:28; and that P knows nothing of Moses having been up to this time anywhere else than in Egypt. It would be better to say that according to the critical partition Moses' previous history is an absolute blank in P; he neither knows where Moses has been nor what he has done, until suddenly and without explanation he comes into view in this transaction. There is no intimation that he had spent all his life in Egypt, nor that this was the first revelation made to him. The contrary seems to be implied in 6:28, where the Lord's speaking to Moses *in the land of Egypt* suggests a contrast with what he had spoken to him elsewhere. The simple fact, uncontradicted by any statement or implication in the whole narrative, is that God first appeared to Moses in Midian and summoned him to his work; he revealed himself to him again in Egypt after his unsuccessful appeal to Pharaoh.

(2) *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 28, "6:2sq. naturally means that God *introduces* himself to Moses as Yahweh, a name by which he has never before been known. But what does that mean in the face of 3:15? Would a writer forget himself so in the same section? Would he use such language and thus contradict a former statement?"

a. One would think that the very absurdity of their conclusions would lead the critics to reconsider their premises. No writer would so flatly contradict himself of course. Nor would any sensible Redactor. Can that interpretation of 6:3 be correct, which puts it in glaring and absolute contradiction with every previous passage in which the name Jehovah occurs? Is it conceivable that R, the presumed compiler of this great national history, used language in 6:3 which gives the lie to the whole antecedent portion of his work? that he in this verse uses language which means that the word Jehovah had never been heard nor uttered by the patriarchs, and yet in repeated passages before avers that it had been in constant use from the days of Eve and Enos downward? And yet the entire critical hypothesis is based on precisely this assumption.

b. It has before been shown, *HEBRAICA*, V., p. 187, that the critical interpretation of Ex. 6:3 is contradicted by the uniform meaning of the phrase in the mouth of God "know that I am Jehovah," which is used no less than twelve times in the immediately following chapters of Exodus with specific reference to the passage before us; it is contradicted likewise by the uniform usage of the phrase "to know the name of Jehovah" as found throughout the Scriptures. These expressions never denote an external acquaintance with the word Jehovah, but always a manifestation of the perfections of Jehovah in human experience. Such a manifestation should be accorded to the children of Israel under Moses as had never been witnessed by the patriarchs. The passage does not concern itself with the history of the word "Jehovah" and no inference can be drawn from it on this subject. Consequently it does not afford the slightest basis of conjecture that it once belonged to a document which sedulously avoided the use of the divine name Jehovah up to this point and thenceforth employed it.

c. But upon any interpretation of 6:3 there is no imaginable conflict between it and 3:15. Even if it meant that the word Jehovah was unknown to the patriarchs, there is no intimation or suggestion that it had not previously been made known to Moses. The charge of forgetfulness or selfcontradiction on the part of the writer is, therefore, on any view of the passage entirely gratuitous.

(3) *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 27, "From JE it would seem that Yahweh was known as the God of the patriarchs (3:15); in P this name is first revealed to Moses."

But according to all the critics 3:15 belongs to E; their uniform contention is that E in ch. 3 records the first revelation of the name Jehovah and they make this the basis of their assertion that it is parallel to ch. 6 and a narrative of the very same event by a different writer. On the critical hypothesis E and P alike

maintain that the name Jehovah was first revealed to Moses; so that even from this point of view the alleged conflict does not exist. But in truth neither ch. 3 nor ch. 6 concern themselves about the time when the word Jehovah first came into use; so that there is no room for any variance between them in respect to it.

(4) It is alleged that according to P, 6:9,12, the people in their dejection and distress would not hearken to Moses, whereas according to J, 3:18; 4:31 they believed his message.

But the seeming conflict is produced by the critics themselves, who confuse two separate occasions. When Moses first spoke to the people they believed; but when they found that the only result of his intervention was to increase their burdens, they would no longer hearken to him. Dillmann acknowledges that there is no contradiction here; that J or E must have given an account of the people's reception of the promise made in 6:1 and that R inserted 6:9 from that account.

(5) Other differences alleged, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 27, are quite trivial. "In J (3:7) and in E (3:9), God sees the oppression as well as hears their cry (that is, he is near); in P he only *hears*." But it is expressly said in P 2:25 that he sees (אֵרָא) as well as hears, 2:24; 6:5. "According to P, God listens to Israel simply because he remembered his covenant with the patriarchs; but in JE it is his compassion for their suffering." "Simply" is inserted without warrant; while the title "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," 3:6,15,16 JE shows his memory of his covenant. "P knows nothing of Moses' lack of faith; while the prophetic writers make much of it (3:11-13; 4:1-17)." But Moses' original reluctance to undertake his mission was overcome, 4:18; why should it be expected to reappear subsequently in ch. 6? And yet 6:12,30 does show something of the same shrinking and sense of personal unfitness as 4:10.

(6) It is further alleged that in JE 3:18, permission is sought to go three days' journey into the wilderness, while in P, 6:11, the demand made upon Pharaoh is that he let the children of Israel go unconditionally; in JE, 6:1, the king himself is to drive them out, while in P, 7:4, the Lord shall lead them forth without the king's permission; in JE, 4:22, Moses but in P, 7:2, Aaron is the speaker in the presence of the king. These points can best be reserved for future consideration.

The fifth critical argument for sundering 6:2-7:7 from the immediately preceding context is drawn from its language and style which is said to be that of P and in marked contrast with that of the previous section.

But (1) it should be noted that the characteristic expressions of 6:2-4 are all taken from Genesis, ch. 17. "Jehovah appeared unto Abraham;" "God Almighty," Gen. 17:1; "establish my covenant," v. 7; "give the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage," v. 8. God known to Isaac and Jacob as God Almighty is with allusion to Gen. 28:3 and 35:11, both of which passages are also

based on Gen. 17. The repeated recurrence of these and other expressions drawn from Gen. 17 in combination does not indicate that the passages in which they are found are by a different writer from the rest of the narrative, who may be supposed always to employ them in preference to other equivalent phrases. These reminiscences of God's covenant with Abraham naturally clothe themselves in the very language of that great fundamental transaction, so momentous to him and to his descendants. But this does not prevent the same writer from using different forms of speech, when this particular transaction is not immediately in his thoughts.

(2) After 6:2-4, whose expressions are borrowed from Gen. 17, and v. 5* which is similarly related to 2:23,24, the language is no longer purely such as is credited to P. Thus vs. 6,7 "burdens" סבלת; v. 6 "rid" הצייל; v. 8, "bring you into the land," the oath to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, lifting up the hand in token of an oath are all marks of JE, and "heritage" מורשה which occurs but once beside in the Hexateuch, is not the word that would be expected in P. With these are blended other expressions said to be characteristic of P as v. 6, "bondage" עבדה (but see Gen. 29:27; 30:26; Ex. 5:9,11 JE), "with a stretched out arm," for which JE has v. 1 "with a strong hand" (but in Deuteronomy the same writer repeatedly uses both together); "judgments" (also 7:4 and but twice beside in Hexateuch); v. 7, "I will be to you a God" (a phrase borrowed from Gen. 17:7, and here joined with "I will take you to me for a people," which occurs nowhere else in P) and "ye shall know that I am Jehovah." These mixed criteria in vs. 6-8, freely used by the same writer, can only be accounted for by the critics as due to the manipulation of R, and according to Dillmann vs. 9-13 are also made up by R partly from P and partly from JE.

(3) This brings us to the genealogical table, vs. 14 sqq., which Kayser attributes not to P but to R, and Wellhausen only partly to P, alleging that R must have added Aaron's descendants, while Jülicher maintains that the table as originally prepared by P was fuller than it is at present, embracing descendents of all the sons of Jacob, and that a part of it was omitted by R. All insist that it has been displaced and put in an incongruous position. The oddest of all reasons for this displacement is that assigned, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 28, "in order to separate vs. 10-12 from 29 sq., which are practically identical;" as if it were not apparent that the language of vs. 10-12 is purposely repeated in 29 sq., in order formally to resume the subject interrupted by a brief digression. Dillmann gives the following account of the matter. In his opinion 7:1-5 is the proper answer given in P to the question of 6:12, and originally followed it immediately. But having inserted 9b and 12ba from J, R adds v. 13 as in sense if not in words the answer

* In 6:5 "groaning" נאקה is counted as belonging to P, though it occurs but once beside in the Hex. 2:24; so "God remembering," but it is found also in JE Gen. 30:32; Ex. 32:13,

given in J; whereupon not to confuse the accounts from his two sources he first inserts the genealogy vs. 12-27, and then returns to the subject by an insertion of his own, vs. 28-30, introducing Moses' objection and adding from P the Lord's answer, 7:1-5; "a procedure" he remarks, "which is very suggestive of the peculiar conscientiousness of R." This seems to mean that R religiously preserves distinct whatever is contained in his sources, even when as in this instance one simply states in a summary form, 6:13, what the other gives in more detail, 7:1-6. How is it then that this same R, according to the critics, has left such serious gaps in his sources elsewhere in even the most important matters, as we have seen in repeated instances? All this critical manipulation shows that the critics are very far from being united in opinion in respect to this genealogy, though in fact it is just where and what it should be.

Dillmann very properly rebukes the prevalent notion among the critics that any degree of incongruity is sufficiently accounted for by charging it upon an interpolation or referring it to R. Why should an interpolator or redactor be imagined to have no sense of propriety? When the decisive point is reached that Moses and Aaron receive their final commission to Pharaoh, the writer pauses to trace their line of descent, then resumes his subject and proceeds as before. No more appropriate place could be found, nor one in better accord with the general plan of the work. There is accordingly no ground for the suggestion that this detailed account of Moses' parentage is by a different writer and one more familiar with his family history than the author of the general statement, 2:1. The particulars respecting his ancestry were purposely reserved until he assumed the leadership of Israel and confronted Pharaoh with his demands on their behalf.

(4) Even 7:1-7 is not free from difficulty for the critics, for one of J's words **אות** *sign* occurs v. 3, which Dillmann thinks it necessary to eject and attribute to R.

All this goes to show that whenever the critics undertake to assign any continuous portion of the narrative to P, they find themselves in trouble.

1. LANGUAGE OF P.*

OLD WORDS.

(1) **נפש** = person, VI., p. 117. (2) **פרה ורכה** P Sect. 9, Lang. of P. (3) **כאזר כאזר** V., p. 174 (7:19). (4) **שרץ** in J, Ex. 7:28. (5) **אלהים** explained before. (6) **אל שרי** Sect. 5, Lang. of P. (7) **הקים ברית** V., p. 174 (6:18). (8) **אלה** משפחות only in genealogical tables and hence uniformly referred to P. (9) **תלדות** V., p. 152. (10) **שני חיי** Sect. 6, Lang. of P. (11) **למשפחותם** V., p. 174 (8:13 sqq.).

NEW WORDS.

(1) **יצא ירך** in O. T. only Gen. 46:26; Ex. 1:5 P, for which Gen. 35:11 P has **יצאו יצאיו**; under other circumstances the critics would have insisted that this was the mark of a different writer.

(2) **פרך** in Hexateuch only Ex. 1:13,14; Lev. 25:43,46,53.

(3) **יהוה** explained before.

(4) **ראש אבות** a genealogical term and as such always referred to P.

* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 26; the references are to previous explanations.

Knobel reckons among the marks of P עָרַל שְׁפָתַיִם of *uncircumcised lips*, 6:12,30 which occurs nowhere else in the Hexateuch, nor even in the entire Bible. Other alleged marks of P are "Pharaoh, king of Egypt," 6:11,13,27,29, an emphatic combination, which occurs but four times in all the Hexateuch beside, Gen. 41:46; Ex. 14:8 (verses cut out of a JE connection and assigned to P) and Deut. 7:8; 11:3; elsewhere Pharaoh and the king of Egypt are freely interchanged 1:18,19; 5:4,5; 14:5. "The land of Canaan," 6:4, which nevertheless occurs at least fifteen times in JE in the Book of Genesis, 42:5, 7,13,29,32; 44:8; 45:17,25; 46:31; 47:1,4,13,14,15; 50:5 כֶּמֶת *one hundred*, 6:16,18; this construct form nowhere occurs in J or E, but even the absolute מֵאָה is only found in J, Gen. 6:3; 26:12 and in E Gen. 33:19; Josh. 24:32, unless con-

trary to the usual critical rule the record of Joseph's age, Gen. 50:22,26 and of Joshua, Josh. 24:29 are added; and in these instances the construct could not be used. צָנָא *host* applied to Israel, 6:26; 7:4; but both E, Gen. 21:22,32 and J, Gen. 26:26 use this word, and E speaks of Israel, Ex. 13:18 as equipped for war, and 14:19,20 a camp, implying that they were conceived of as an army. שָׂמַע with אֵל 6:9,12,30; 7:4, while in JE it is construed with בָּקוֹל or לְקוֹל 3:18; 4:1,8,9; 5:2; but J has שָׂמַע אֵל Gen. 16:11, and E, Gen. 30:17,22. The emphatic and somewhat pleonastic phrase, Ex. 7:6, "And Moses and Aaron did as the Lord commanded them, so did they": but a like phrase occurs 12:28 at the end of a J section from which the critics sunder it for no other reason than their own assumption that it always must belong to P.

2. STYLE.

It is easy to produce from the sections assigned to J and E parallels to all that is alleged of P in this respect, HEBRAICA, VI., p. 27 sq. How is P more "systematic" (1) in the "résumé of Jacob's family" 1:1-5 than J in Nahor's family, Gen. 23:20-24 or E in that of Keturah 25:1-4? (2) in "the use of אֱלֹהִים up to 6:3 and יְהוָה after it" (which is a mere assumption) than J in the use of Jacob up to Gen. 35:10 and Israel after it, as Dillmann claims? The systematic character of "the genealogy of Moses and Aaron" recognized in (3) and (4) and attributed to P is a sufficient reply to the cavils of critics respecting it.

How is P more "exact, numerical" in mentioning (1) "70 souls," 1:5, than J in 7 days and 40 days and 40 nights, Gen. 7:4, or E in 200 she-goats, 20 he-goats, 200 ewes, 20 rams, 30 milch-camels, 40 kine, 10 bulls, 20 she-asses, 10 foals, Gen. 32:14 sq., or 2 wives, 2 handmaids and 11 children, v. 22? or (2) the age of Levi, (3) Kohath, (4) Amram, (5) Moses and Aaron, than E in that of Joseph, Gen. 50:22,26 and Joshua, Josh. 24:29, not to speak of Gen. 37:2; 41:46 which are torn from their connection in order to assign them to P? or (6) in the recurring genealogical formulae than J in the births recorded, Gen. 29:32-35?

P is called "rigid, stereotyped," because of the constant use of the same phrases "at the opening and closing" of genealogies and "summing up" each subdivision. Genealogies are mostly assigned by rule to P,* so that there is small

* The occurrence of יָלַד in certain genealogies and הוֹלִיד in others has been made a pretext for assigning the former to J and the latter to P. This was traced by Kurtz, as stated HEBRAICA, V., p. 188, to variations in the old genealogical registers themselves, from which Moses has given extracts. It is observable, however, that הוֹלִיד is invariably used in the main line of descent and יָלַד as invariably in the side lines; to this 10:24 is no exception as it is here the antecedent of v. 26, and 17:20 is not in a genealogy. The more dignified word seems thus to have been set apart for the former, and the less dignified restricted to the latter, which certainly has the look of purpose rather than accident and may be more naturally explained as intentional variation by one writer, than the chance commingling of different writers.

opportunity to compare JE in this respect, yet see Gen. 22:23b; 25:4b, and ch. 36, considerable portions of which are assigned to J, though the critics are in much perplexity and disagreement. JE, however, is equally marked by the frequent use of identical phrases elsewhere, e. g., bring them into a land flowing with milk and honey, unto the land of the Canaanites and the Hittites, etc., etc., 3:8,17; 13:5; 33:1-3; cf. also 23:23; Josh. 3:10; 24:11; "the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob," Gen. 50:24; Ex. 33:1; Num. 32:11; Deut. 34:4; cf. Ex. 13:5,11; 32:13; Num. 11:12; 14:23; Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, Ex. 3:6,15, 16; 4:5; יקר וישתחו "bowed the head and worshiped," Gen. 24:26,48; 43:28; Ex. 4:31; 12:27; 34:8; Num. 22:31; "not believe nor hearken to the voice," Ex. 4:1,8,9; "I will be with thy mouth and teach thee what thou shalt say," Ex. 4:12,15.

How is P more "verbose and repetitious," "(1) 1:1b," than E in Gen. 40:5a; 41:11,12? or "(2) 1:7" than the amplification of J in Gen. 15:18-21, or even Gen. 8:22? If "(3) 2:24a adds nothing to 23b," does 3:9 E add more to 3:7? If "(4) 2:25" and "(5) 6:4b are unnecessary," how is it with 5:5b after v. 4 E, or 4:10 "of a slow tongue" after "slow of speech" J? (6) Is Aaron's wife more minutely described than Nahor's wife by J, Gen. 11:29? "(7) either 6:26 or 27 is wholly unnecessary." This is a mistake: v. 26 states what the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, v. 27 what they said to Pharaoh.

3. MATERIAL.

The "duplicates," "inconsistencies," "cases in which R's work appears," and most of the "differences" have already been explained. It is sufficient to add that (1) and (2) of the "differences" are confessedly to be accounted for "as co-existing facts." (3) "In J (3:7) and in E (3:9) God sees, etc., in P he only hears;" this overlooks the explicit statement in P 2:25 and God saw וירא. (5) "According to JE, Israel is spoken of by God as his people (3:7,10); but in P, he is just about to make them his nation (6:7)." This again overlooks 6:4 P, "my people the children of Israel."

4. THEOLOGY.

If "(1) the cry of the suffering goes up to God, 2:23," P, so it does 3:9 E; if in J God "comes down," 3:8, a like condescension is implied elsewhere in P in God's dwelling in the midst of his people, Ex. 29:45,46, filling the tabernacle with his glory, Ex. 40:35, and going up from Abraham, Gen. 17:22 and from Jacob, Gen. 35:13 after conversing with them. And here God's delivering aid is granted, which in Scripture phrase is as far as possible from being "remote." (2) "He only hears of their suffering, 2:24," (this is not an adequate paraphrase of "hearing their groaning"); "JE he sees it as well 3:7,9," so he does in P, 2:25. (3) "He only speaks to Moses, 6:2,10; 7:1; in JE he appears visibly, 3:2 sq." This

like the other things alleged only results from the critical sundering of what belongs together. Even thus, however, God tells Moses, 6:3 P, that he had "appeared" to the patriarchs, but was about to make a more ample disclosure of himself to Israel. And when Moses spake "before the Lord," 6:12, P, there may be a suggestion of a visible manifestation, which seems to be corroborated by 5:22 "Moses returned unto the Lord."

"God's revelation is formal: (1) his compassion is due to a promise made to the patriarchs, 2:24; 6:4 sq." God's gracious love to Israel for their fathers' sake is equally implied in JE in his announcing himself to Moses and to the people as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, 3:6 sqq. "There is no familiarity between him and Moses; he simply orders; there is no sign, no persuasion as in JE," In point of fact there is the same condescending grace to Moses in his discouragement 6:31-7:2, P, as in his initial timidity, 4:10-16, J, and God promises, 7:3 P, "to multiply his signs in the land of Egypt."

"There is no indication of anthropomorphism." "The covenant with the patriarchs is emphasized." If I am capable of judging, these two sentences are contradictory. "In the prophetic writers there is no mention of" this covenant. What then is meant by God's calling himself the "God of their fathers," 3:13, 15, 16; 4:5, or by Gen. 15:18 J or Gen. 50:24 E?

B. The Portion assigned to J and E.

A glance at the conflicting modes of division, which here prevail, as they are exhibited, *HEBRAICA*, VI., pp. 28 sq., 32, is sufficient to show the hopeless perplexity and confusion in which the critics find themselves. This is frankly confessed, *ibid*, p. 35. (1) "It is freely admitted that the *prophetic* portion of this section does not show very distinctly, or even satisfactorily, a double authorship. (a) There are no duplicate stories (i. e., in a full form); (b) the language also is but a poor guide, owing probably to R's influence. [It is very convenient always to have R to throw the blame upon]. (c) Not even the names of the Deity are to be relied on implicitly, being freely intermingled. (2) We may, therefore, expect—what is actually the case—to find the greatest variation of opinion among the critics. So for instance, Kuen. and Kitt. pronounce the analysis of JE in the *early* chapters of Exodus, at least, almost impossible." When it is added that there are "sure traces" and "long passages clearly belonging to either writer," we shall see hereafter what these amount to. As to P being "very marked when contrasted with JE," we have already seen the insufficiency of the grounds for any such partition.

1. Chapter 1.

Omitting the verses assigned to P, Wellhausen partitions the remainder of the chapter by giving to J v. 6 (as a doublet of Gen, 50:26 E), vs. 8-10 the pro-

posal of the new king (as related to J in language), which is severed from its proper basis in the immense multiplication of Israel, v. 7 P in spite of the evident allusion of *more and mightier* רב ועצום v. 9 to *multiplied and waxed mighty* וירבו ויעצמו v. 7. These words must accordingly be cut out of v. 7 as a part of a hypothetical sentence belonging to J. The same words recur, v. 20b, and must be once more sundered from their connection and given to J, though there is nothing to which to attach them. Then follows v. 22 the barbarous edict issued by the king to his people to murder all male children, which thus becomes the first and only measure of repression resorted to, instead of the last desperate expedient after all others had failed. Moreover, v. 22, thus sundered from vs. 15-20, which are essential to its proper explanation and limitation,* would not apply specially to the children of the Hebrews. It is also sundered from 2:1-10 E, of which it supplies the necessary explanation. The residue, vs. 11,12,15-20a, is referred to E, and is an unexplained fragment, whose only reason and motive is found in J vs. 8-10.

Kittel abandons this division, though for the sake of finding the multiplication and consequent oppression of Israel in J as well as E he retains vs. 20b,22 for the former, the inconveniences of which have been already shown.

Other critics give up the attempt to separate what is so plainly indivisible and assign the whole to E. This is attended with the difficulty that subsequent sections of J as well as E imply this very narrative, and with the further difficulty that certain words elsewhere alleged to belong to J are here combined with those of E. Hence it has been assumed that though written by E it has been retouched by J, or that the words in question were introduced by R from a supposed parallel narrative by J, a further trace of whose existence is suspected in the imaginary doublet of v. 20a and 21. But v. 21 is obviously a more definite expansion of the general statement, 20a. And the assumption that these are traces of a parallel narrative otherwise unknown like similar assumptions with which we have met repeatedly before, has no basis but the hypothesis which it is adduced to support. A much more natural conclusion, which must stand until the contrary is proved, is that words thus bound together in one continuous passage are the common property of one and the same writer.

2. Chapter 2.

Wellhausen assigns vs. 1-10 to E and vs. 11-23a to J. But vs. 11-14 cannot be separated from what precedes. "When Moses was grown," v. 11, alludes to the previous narrative of his early childhood; "he went out (וּיצֵא) unto his brethren" to his having been "brought in (וּתְבִאָהוּ) unto Pharaoh's daughter," v. 10; "their burdens" as 1:11; Egyptian and Hebrew, vs. 11-14 as 1:15,16,19; 2:6,7; "made thee prince over" (שָׂם שָׂר עָלָיִךְ) v. 14 as 1:11.

* The verbal correspondence between v. 22 and vs. 17,18 *saved alive* is also to be noted.

Accordingly Schrader and Dillmann give vs. 1-14 to E and vs. 15-23a to J. But vs. 11-14* is as essential to what follows as to what precedes. Moses is the brave defender of the weak and injured alike in vs. 11,12 and in v. 17. His flight, v. 15, was in consequence of its being known that he had killed the Egyptian. Schrader's notion that the motive assigned in v. 14 differs from that in v. 15 is set aside as futile by Dillmann and Jülicher. The peril in its becoming known was that it would reach the ears of the king. "The men who sought thy life," 4:19, are, as the form of expression shows, 2:15a, cf. 18:4, Pharaoh and his emissaries, and the death of the former is recorded, 2:23a.

Dillmann rests the division on the difference of names, Reuel 2:18, and Jethro 3:1 E; and then oddly enough annuls his own argument by insisting that there is a textual error in the name, 2:18. Instead of "Reuel," he says it should be "Hobab, the son of Reuel," as Num. 10:29. But if a change is to be made from mere conjecture, without even the pretence of any ancient authority, why not read "Jethro, the son of Reuel," as Ewald proposed? This would have a *quasi* confirmation from the LXX., which critics are fond of urging when it makes in their favor, so far at least as that Jethro is there introduced into 2:16,17. But then all pretext would be gone for assigning 2:15-23 and ch. 3 to distinct writers, and that is not what Dillmann wants. Wellhausen and Jülicher find no difficulty in ascribing 2:15 sqq. and 3:1 sqq. to the same writer, by expunging Reuel from the text of 2:18; and so the former gives both to J, the latter both to E. All which illustrates the ease with which a critic can effect his purpose; if the text does not suit him, he can construct one that will.

But if, as Dillmann contends, the same person could not have written Reuel, 2:18 and Jethro, 3:1, how could an intelligent redactor, who expected his work to be credited and understood, have put those sections together in their present form? The critics tell us that he introduces explanatory remarks upon occasion and even alterations for the sake of harmonizing discrepancies or removing difficulties. That he left the text as it is, may then be taken as a clear indication that he saw nothing that required explanation, and no discrepancy to remove. If therefore, as we must suppose, the statements here made were in the judgment of R mutually consistent and sufficiently intelligible, why may not the original writer have been of the same opinion? and why may not one and the same writer have produced both paragraphs? We fully accord with the remark of Dr. Dillmann already quoted that nothing is explained by charging incongruity upon R.

The passages before us are to be compared with Num. 10:29, Hobab, Moses' חֹבָב, the son of Reuel, cf. Judg. 4:11. They contain, as Kurtz remarks, *Geschichte d. Alten Bundes*, II., p. 53, two elastic words, viz., *father* which may be

* The falsity of the critical dictum that the same writer must always make use of the same words, is well illustrated by Jülicher from vs. 11-14, where נָצַח and הִכָּה, הִכָּה and הָרָג are interchanged in the same brief passage.

used either of an immediate parent or of a grandparent, and יתן which like the Greek *γαμβρός* may denote either a father-in-law or a brother-in-law. Hence arise various possible solutions, any one of which is a sufficient answer to the charge of discrepancy.

1. Reuel, father of Zipporah as well as of Jethro and Hobab, brothers-in-law of Moses.

2. Reuel, grandfather of Zipporah and father of Jethro = Hobab, father-in-law of Moses.

3. Reuel = Jethro, father-in-law of Moses, and the father of Hobab the brother-in-law of Moses.

This last seems to me altogether the most satisfactory. Reuel was his proper name and Jethro or Jether, Ex. 4:18 (i. e. Excellency) his official designation.* And there is no more difficulty in their being successively used in the same connection than if one should first name President Harrison and afterwards refer to him as His Excellency.

While Wellhausen gives 2:11-23a to J, and Dillmann vs. 15-23a, Jülicher insists that vs. 1-22 belong to E and only 23a to J. Verses 16 sqq. are plainly related to 3:1 by their common reference to Moses' marriage to the daughter of the priest of Midian and the flock of the latter. They are intimately linked with both of the documents, as the critics regard them, viz., with 18:2,3 E, cf. 2:21,22, a coincidence which Dillmann can only account for by assuming that J has here copied from E; also with 4:19 J, which evidently refers to 2:23a, which latter as evidently points back to 1:8 E. While thus assigning, each in his own varying fashion, one portion of the narrative to J and another to E, the critics confess that each document contains implications of and allusions to what is found only in the other. They find it impossible so to construct their documents, that they shall be independent of each other. Serious gaps are left in J, which need precisely what is given in E to fill them, and *vice versa*. Only Jülicher ventures the conjecture that E may have been the only narrator, who told of Moses' rescue by Pharaoh's daughter, J may have spoken briefly of the oppression in Egypt, and then, without knowing anything of children put to death by midwives or Egyptians, may have proceeded at once to the history of Moses. But even he is obliged to assume not only that J and E are mutually supplementary, but that P shows abundant marks of acquaintance with them. Such references from one of the alleged documents to another, of which we have found repeated instances, are indications of a common authorship.

Wellhausen is alone in the attempt to make out a separate narrative of J in ch. 2, which after all he confesses cannot be carried through. This is done by

* Posset יתן *Jithro* nomen esse muneris aut dignitatis, ut Pharaoh; nam יתר dignitatem significat. Atque hoc videtur sensisse Josephus, II., 12, 1, qui ἐπικλημα esse dixit Ἰεθραϊόν. Clericus Comment. in Ex. 2:18.

interpreting vs. 1,2 to mean that Moses was the eldest child of his parents, and then slicing from vs. 6 and 10 such portions as make no mention of Moses' sister, thus producing the semblance of another form of the story in which she has no part, but which runs thus "and behold, a weeping babe, and she had compassion on him and he became her son. And she called his name Moses, and said, Because I drew him out of the water." Meanwhile the omission of these clauses does not disturb the apparent continuity of the principal narrative. This is a fair specimen of the method, which Wellhausen everywhere employs in his attempts to establish duplicate narratives, and which is in fact adopted by that class of critics generally. It is ingenious and clever but baseless. How entirely arbitrary it is and how void of all historical value are results so obtained, is apparent.

3. Chapter 3.

Knobel assigns this and the two following chapters to J, who has here in the main not written independently but transcribed two older documents. One of these, which he calls the *Rechtsbuch* or Law-book, is represented in ch. 3 and is continued in 4:18,27-31, but in this latter section with additions by J. The writer of this document uses *Elohim* interchangeably with *Jehovah*, as is seen in the frequent alternation of these names in ch. 3; he agrees with P in holding that the name *Jehovah* was first introduced in the time of Moses, 3:14 sq.; he calls Moses' father-in-law not *Reuel* as in 2:18, but *Jethro*, 3:1, or *Jether*, 4:18; he speaks of the elders accompanying Moses when he went to Pharaoh, 3:18; of the women as borrowing or asking for jewels of gold and silver and costly raiment from their female neighbors, 3:22, to put upon their sons and daughters to wear in the feast which they were to observe in the wilderness, while according to 11:1 the borrowing was by every man and every woman and 12:35, by the people without distinction of sex.

The other document, which Knobel calls the *Kriegsbuch* or Book of Wars, is represented in 4:19-26, which is the direct continuation of 2:11-22. The writer of it agrees with P in making Moses demand the complete and unconditional release of Israel, 4:23, and Moses is to perform the signs before Pharaoh, 4:21. These older narratives agree with each other and with P in speaking only of miracles wrought upon or in the presence of the Egyptians, 3:20; 4:21.

On the other hand, 4:1-17 is by J himself, and tells of miracles wrought by Moses as his credentials before the Israelites, vs. 1 sqq. makes Aaron the speaker even with the children of Israel, vs. 16,30 regards Moses' shepherd staff as the rod with which the miracles were performed, v. 2, and records how Moses presumptuously declined the divine commission, v. 13, while the older accounts only speak of doubts or scruples which he entertained. Knobel further points out in minute detail the peculiar diction of each of these writers severally.

The little weight attached by critics themselves to such nice discriminations in style and in conception appears from the fact that these divisions of Knobel, sharply as they are made, and with all the array of minute distinctions both in thought and language, which he urges in their favor, have not been adopted by any of his critical successors. In fact nothing is easier than to create such factitious distinctions in any narrative. If it be divided into parts, and the separate parts be then compared together, it will of course be found that one does not relate precisely what is in the other. Each particular portion of a narrative tells its own part of the story and this naturally enough is not identical with what is told in the remaining portions. The points, in which one supplements the other, are not to be paraded as divergences, so long as there is no real variance. And a varying diction is not to be assumed because the writer has occasion to use words in one section which he does not need to employ in another.

The perplexity of the critics in ch. 3 arises from such an intermingling of what they regard as the criteria of different documents, that it is impossible to separate them. The one point in which they all agree is in assigning vs. 10-15 to E, and this not on the score of any peculiarity of diction, but simply because the fundamental postulate of this divisive hypothesis requires it. The primary assumption that a distinguishing feature of J is the use of the name Jehovah from the beginning, while in E it was first revealed to Moses, necessarily carries with it the ascription of this passage to the latter. But in all the rest of the chapter they are at sea. Wellhausen, though he acknowledges that the entire paragraph 3:1-4:17 creates the impression of unity or of one casting, nevertheless gives 3:1-9, 16-20 to J (with traces of E), and vs. 21,22 to E; Jülicher 3:7,8,16-22 to J, vs. 1-6,9-14 to E; Dillmann, the whole chapter to E (with traces of J).

When the alleged criteria of different documents are thus inseparably blended, the critics lay the responsibility upon R, who has not followed one document exclusively, but is supposed to have introduced words or phrases from an imaginary parallel in the other. But

(1) This is supporting hypothesis by hypothesis, and no particular reason can be given why R should have done this here and in other instances in which the like assumption is made.

(2) Such an assumption, moreover, undermines the very basis of the entire critical hypothesis. The determination of distinctive marks for the documents, by which the whole analysis is conducted and is held to be justified, takes for granted that the extracts from each have been preserved in their original form. If this is not the case, the foundation of their argument is gone. If R has blended and confused these documents with the frequency and to the extent that the critics are themselves obliged to assume, where is the guarantee that he has not done the same in other instances?

(3) What hypothesis, however unreasonable, could not be successfully main-

tained, if everything at variance with its requirements is held to be sufficiently accounted for by attributing it to R?

(4) The obvious inference from the premises before us is not that the text is at fault, nor that R has jumbled his sources together, but that the critics are not infallible. Their previous conclusions are based on insufficient data. What they have taken to be marks of distinct writers, are here shown to belong alike to one and the same.

4. Chapter 4.

The critical analysis of this chapter is based on certain alleged discrepancies, which are no discrepancies at all.

(1) After the Lord appeared to Moses in Horeb and commissioned him to deliver Israel, Moses asks, v. 18, and obtains permission from Jethro to return to Egypt. In v. 19 the Lord bids him to return to Egypt, assuring him that the men are dead, who sought his life. And it is gravely represented that these are mutually exclusive, which they manifestly are not.

(2) It is charged that v. 20a, in which Moses takes his wife and sons with him to Egypt, conflicts with 18:2sqq. from which it appears that they were subsequently with Jethro,—not, as the critics infer in direct contradiction to its express language, that he left her behind, but he *sent her back*. This clause the critics strike out and assign to R for no reason whatever, except that by doing so an apparent contradiction can be created. Those, to whom it is not an accepted canon that everything is to be expunged from the text, which establishes its coherence and consistency, will see no contrariety here.

(3) In v. 20, we read of Moses that “he returned to the land of Egypt.” And yet in the following verse the Lord says to him “When thou goest to return into Egypt,” etc. This, it is claimed, is not a continuous narrative. But the explanation is perfectly simple. Upon the first mention of his setting out the general statement is made, as is usual in Hebrew narrative, respecting his whole journey, “he returned to the land of Egypt.” The incidents of the journey are then recited particularly, his taking the rod, the Lord’s direction to him what to do with it, and what to say to Pharaoh, the affair at the lodging-place, and the meeting with Aaron.

(4) Wellhausen further charges that v. 27 is not the sequel of vs. 24–26, for at the lodging-place where the latter incident occurred, Moses was already beyond the mount of God, where Aaron was to meet him. How he knows where the lodging-place was, he does not inform us. But supposing him correct in this particular, the whole point of his objection lies in the assumption that a continuous narrative cannot deviate from the exact chronological arrangement of every detail. The writer here chooses to follow a topical order instead. As he has mentioned Moses’ wife and sons, v. 20, he mentions an affair in which they

were concerned before proceeding to speak of his meeting with Aaron who was to act with him upon his arrival in Egypt. The chronological sequence does not lie in the initial term **וַיֵּאמֶר**, but in the transaction, which it introduces, vs. 27-31, considered as a whole. See numerous similar examples in the discussion of Gen. 2:19; *HEBRAICA*, V., p. 148.

(5) It is alleged that vs. 17,20b,21 the rod with which Moses was to do signs before Pharaoh is quite a different conception from vs. 1-9, which records a series of miracles designed to accredit Moses before the people, in only one of which a rod is mentioned and that not as the instrument but as itself the subject of the miracle. Hence it is claimed that v. 17 does not refer back to the rod of vs. 2,4, but to some narrative not preserved, in which a rod was consecrated and endued with miraculous virtue for Moses' use in Egypt. But there is not the slightest discrepancy here, nor any suggestion of different narratives. All proceeds regularly and continuously. Moses was solicitous lest the people would not believe that the Lord had appeared to him, and the Lord gave him a series of signs to convince them. He was further charged to work miracles before Pharaoh, and for this purpose was bidden to take "this rod," i. e. the rod which had been changed to a serpent, as 7:15 explicitly declares. This testimony the critics seek to evade by ascribing it to R, it being their invariable usage to put an unwelcome witness summarily out of court.

(6) Wellhausen and Jülicher find an inconsistency between vs. 10-12, in which, upon Moses' plea of incapacity to speak, the Lord promises to be with his mouth, and vs. 13-16, where his continued reluctance is overcome by associating Aaron with him, as though Aaron's help were more reassuring than that of God himself, and besides in chs. 7-11 it is not Aaron but Moses who speaks to Pharaoh. On critical principles, then, vs. 13-16 must be by another writer than vs. 10-12, J; it cannot be by E, who gives no such prominence to Aaron, nor by P, whose parallel they find in 7:1,2. Wellhausen and Jülicher accordingly refer it to Rj (who combined J and E). But Kittel aptly replies, why should Rj introduce Aaron here, if he was not mentioned in either of his sources? If this is a case of redactional interference, it can only be attributed to Rd (who added Deuteronomy) or Rh (the final redactor of the Hexateuch), who sought to conform this passage to P's representation. But even this, he urges cannot be so, for the manner of its introduction shows that this was not inserted by the Redactor purely of his own motion. If he were disposed to lay stress on Aaron's presence, and claim for him a prominent share in these transactions, he would have inserted his name elsewhere, or at least whenever Moses came before Pharaoh. But just there it is lacking. This, then, is not something bodily introduced by the Redactor with a purpose; it must have belonged to the original text.

Kittel suggests the possibility that J may have mentioned that Aaron was to be associated with Moses, though not to speak, and this may have been modified

by Rd in 4:13-16 into accordance with P. But the same difficulty arises here as before, that upon this supposition Rd would have made more extensive alterations in what follows. His only resource is to assume that J is itself composite, one of its constituents representing that all goes forward without Aaron, the other assuming his presence and co-operation.

But all this critical floundering is unnecessary. It grows out of the attempt to create a discrepancy, where, as Dillmann has shown, none exists. God's promise to be with Moses is not withdrawn in making Aaron his coadjutor, but he engages to be with them both. And Aaron is to assist Moses, not supersede him either in speech or action. The Lord says, v. 15, "I will be with thy mouth and his mouth and will teach you what ye shall do." Moreover, as this was intended to quiet Moses' anxiety lest the people should not believe him nor hearken to his voice, 4:1, it is unto *the people* that Aaron was to speak for Moses, v. 16, as it is recorded v. 30 that he actually did.

(7) Verses 27-31 are a puzzle to the critics, no one of whom has yet been able to bring them into accord with the marks which he has laid down for distinguishing the documents. Wellhausen admits the close connection of these verses in their present form to be undeniable and that they cannot be parcelled between distinct writers. The gathering of the elders, v. 29, cf. 3:16, and doing the signs before the people, v. 30, cf. vs. 1-9, point according to his scheme to J, who ascribes these acts to Moses. Hence he concludes that in the original form of vs. 29-31, it must have been Moses, who spake to the people and did the signs. Rj inserted Aaron along with him, and prefixed vs. 27,28, that Aaron as well as Moses might have the honor of having previously been at Horeb.

Jülicher credits Rj with a still larger share in the production of these verses. As he assigns 3:16 to E, and makes it a mark of distinction between J and E, that the former speaks of the people and the latter of the elders (not J of both, as Wellhausen), the elders as well as Aaron must have been interpolated in this passage of J. J merely wrote "Moses went and gathered the children of Israel and did the signs before the people." Rj is responsible for all the rest of vs. 27-30.

Dillmann, who concedes that vs. 14-16 belong to the original record and assigns them to J, has no difficulty in reconciling the part attributed to Aaron in vs. 27-31 with their composition by J. But as on his division E speaks of the elders, 3:16, and J of signs wrought and words spoken before the people, 4:1 sqq., 16, he is obliged to parcel these verses between J and E. To the latter he assigns 4:29 and the middle clauses of 31, leaving to J vs. 27,28,30 and the first and last clauses of 31. E wrote "And Moses [^{and Aaron,} of whom E says nothing is an interpolation by Rj] went and gathered together all the elders of the children of Israel...and they heard that Jehovah had visited the children of Israel and that he had seen their affliction." J wrote "And Moses told Aaron all the words of

Jehovah wherewith he had sent him and all the signs wherewith he had charged him. . . . And Aaron spake all the words which Jehovah had spoken unto Moses and did the signs in the sight of the people. And the people believed . . . and they bowed their heads and worshipped."

The perfectly arbitrary character of all these divisions is obvious. The critic, on the basis of his partition elsewhere, lays down marks to distinguish the documents, and then carries them relentlessly through, however the passages to which they are applied may be mangled in the process. The plain fact is that none of the critical schemes can be made to fit this passage. It gathers up in itself references to and exact correspondences with the entire preceding narrative, which the critics insist upon sundering, but whose unity and common origin are here palpably demonstrated.

(8) Certain dislocations are also alleged, which require transpositions of the existing text for their correction. Thus, Dillmann urges that vs. 22,23, though belonging to J, are inappropriate where they are and must originally have stood just before 10:28. As vs. 20b,21 are assigned to E, v. 22 would in J connect directly with v. 20a, so that the very first message, which Moses is instructed to deliver to Pharaoh on his return to Egypt, is the announcement of the last of all the plagues, which was not in fact made till 11:4. And further, according to v. 23 (Hebrew text and Revised version) the demand had already been made upon Pharaoh to let Israel go and he had refused. But all the seeming incongruity is the work of the critics themselves, in sundering what belongs together. It is their thrusting v. 21 from the text, which has destroyed the connection and made all the trouble. Moses is there bidden to do all those wonders before Pharaoh, which God had put in his hand, viz., those that were to be wrought by the rod given him for that purpose, v. 17, but is at the same time informed that in spite of all Pharaoh's heart should be hardened and he would not let the people go. Thereupon it is entirely in place for God to inform Moses of the final result of Pharaoh's obstinacy, and of the message which he shall not immediately indeed, but at the proper time deliver to the reculant monarch. And there was a special reason why this disclosure should be made just then and why the fact should be recorded precisely where it is, as preliminary to the occurrence at the lodging-place, vs. 24-26. God's instrument in avenging Israel against Pharaoh cannot be suffered to be himself regardless of the obligations of an Israelite.

Again, as 4:19 plainly refers back to 2:23a, Wellhausen and Jülicher infer that they belong together, the former claiming that the original place of 2:23a was immediately before 4:19, and the latter, on the contrary, that 4:19 ought to stand immediately after 2:23a. Each succeeds in creating a new divergence between the documents by the transposition. Wellhausen finds that in J Moses resolved to return to Egypt as soon as he received the commission to deliver the children of Israel, 4:18; but in E the direction to return was not given

until a later time after the king of Egypt had died. Jülicher by reversing the transposition discovers that in J Moses had already returned to Egypt before God appeared to him to bid him deliver the people, while in E he was still in Midian when this occurred. It is plain enough that neither discrepancy is in the text: they alike result from a critical process, which is altogether unwarranted.

As the discrepancies and dislocations, which are the only pretext for a critical division of this chapter, turn out upon examination to be imaginary, the division built upon them collapses entirely.

5. Chapter 5:1-6:1.

This passage is according to Wellhausen borrowed entire from J, as shown by the correspondence of 5:3 with 3:18, and נגשים vs. 6,10,13,14 a different word for "taskmasters," from שרי מסים 1:11 E, though he notes two words for "task" or "tale" מתכנת v. 8 and תכן v. 18,* and a redundancy of expression in vs. 4,5. In 5:1 he claims that R has substituted "Moses and Aaron" for "Moses and the elders," which according to 3:18 J must have written.

As, however, Dillmann gives 3:18 to E, this entire passage takes the same direction with him, for which he further pleads the occurrence of פגע vs. 3,20, showing upon what slender grounds the assignment of whole chapters hither and thither may be made. He traces the hand of R in the omission of "the elders" v. 1, the insertion of Aaron vs. 1,4,20, "hold a feast," v. 1, instead of "sacrifice," as 3:18; 5:3, etc., the doublet v. 5 (cf. v. 4), v. 9 (which has a word of P עברה and one of J שעה), 11b (which he fancies would be more appropriate after v. 13), and v. 22 where "returned" is introductory to the renewal of Moses' commission, 6:2sq., and is therefore unwelcome to the critics, who will have it that this is no renewal at all but simply P's account of what E had already described in ch. 3. These alleged manipulations of R, as we have repeatedly seen, merely betoken critical embarrassment and are an acknowledgment that the passage is not in these particulars, what according to the critic's scheme it ought to be; an acknowledgment, which is but scantily covered up by the assumption that R has been borrowing snatches from a hypothetical parallel narrative in J.

Jülicher assigns vs. 1,2,5 to E and the remainder to J, assuming that Rj inserted Aaron, v. 1, and erased from v. 3 "Moses and the elders of Israel," which he supposes to have been expressed as the subject in its original form; though if Rj made this erasure because in his view no other than Aaron was associated with Moses in this transaction, why did he not erase "the elders of Israel" from 3:18 likewise?

* Jülicher remarks that like variations in the use of terms occur several times in the preceding chapters within the limits of what is accounted the same document, and are common in good writers; moreover these very words תכן and מתכנת occur together in the same verse, Ezek. 45:11.

It is of course easy enough for the critics, by the aid of R, to construct a text that will suit their hypothesis, as the present text manifestly does not. The combination here of "Moses and Aaron" will not answer either for Wellhausen's J, or for Dillmann's or Julicher's E. It enters its decided protest against the sun-dering of 3:18 from 4:14-16; which is a feature of every critical scheme. That "the elders" are not particularly mentioned in 4:1-3 is not due to any manipulation by R, as the critics think it necessary to assume. It merely shows that the writer was not so painfully precise as to record subordinate details, which were sufficiently implied in statements already made. It is plain enough from 3:18 that the elders were to accompany Moses and Aaron when they went before the king. Their presence was altogether subsidiary and it is simply taken for granted without further mention that the divine direction was complied with.

The minute and complicated apportionment, which the critics make of the next section, the narrative of the plagues, is based upon a rigorous demand for the explicit statement of every minute particular, which as the instance before us plainly shows is not always to be expected, a refusal to admit implications however obvious in lieu of it, and insisting upon finding a divergence in trifling variations in the form of statement, which are readily explicable without such an assumption.

1. LANGUAGE OF J.

OLD WORDS.

(1) **בָּקֵשׁ** see Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) **הָרַג** also in E, Gen. 20:4,11; 37:20, etc. (3) **רָהֹטִים** Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (4) **גֵּרֶשׁ** *HEBRAICA*, V., p. 154 (also in E and P). (5) **מְרוּעַ** Sect. 7, Lang. of J (also in E). (6) **מִדֶּה** Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (7) **הִצִּיל** Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (8) **אִיה** also in E, Gen. 22:7. (9) **לִמָּה זֶה** Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (10) **עָזָב** also in E, Ex. 23:5; Josh. 8:17; 24:16,20. (11) **יָאֵל** (*Hiph.*) also in E. (12) **יָהוּה**. (13) **צִעֲקָה** Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (14) **וַעֲתָה** also in P, Gen. 48:5 and E, Gen. 21:23, etc. (15) **שָׁמַע בְּקוֹל** Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (also in E). (16) **שָׁלַח יָד** Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also in E). (17) **נָא** Sect. 12, Lang. of E (also in P, Gen. 34:8). (18) **בִּי** Sect. 11, Lang. of J. (19) **אֲנֹכִי** Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also in P, Gen. 23:4, often in E). (20) **נָם...גַּם** Sect. 12, Lang. of J (also in E and P). (21) **תִּמְוֹל** **שִׁלְשָׁם** Sect. 8, Lang. of E (also in P). (22) **חֹרָה** *HEBRAICA*, V., p. 163 (also in E). (23) **לִקְרָאתָ** Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also in E). (24) **שִׁים** *HEBRAICA*, V., p. 154 (also in E and P). (25) **כָּאֵן** Sect.

10, Lang. of E. (26) **מָלֹן** *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 22. (27) **אֵן** Sect. 12, Lang. of J (also E and P). (28) **קָרַר** Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (29) **שָׁעָה** Ex. 5:9 and only Gen. 4:4,5 in Hex. beside. (30) **עָנִי** Gen. 16:11; 29:32 J; 31:42; 41:52 E; Ex. 3:7,17; 4:31 J (Well.) but E (Dill.). (31) **חִיק** Ex. 4:6,7, in Hex. beside only Gen. 16:5; Num. 11:12. (32) **אֶרְנִי** also in E, Gen. 20:4.

NEW WORDS.

(1) **רָלָה** Ex. 2:19*bis* J; 2:6 E. (2) **מִכְאוֹב** Ex. 3:7 J (Well.), E (Dill.); all in Hex. (3) **יָד חֹזֶקָה** Ex. 13:9; 32:11 J; Num. 20:20 E; Ex. 3:19; 6:1 J (Well.), E (Dill.). (4) **זֶנֶב** Ex. 4:4 J; all in Hex. except twice in Deuteronomy. (5) **שָׁלַג** Ex. 4:6 J; Num. 12:10 E worked over by J; all in Hex. (6) **אֵלִים** Ex. 4:4 J; all in Hex. (7) **פָּקַח** Ex. 4:11 J; 23:8 E; all in O. T. (8) **רָפָה** *let go* Ex. 4:26 J; Qál only here in Hex.

* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 30.

It will be observed that no characteristic diction is made out for J; nearly all the words in the foregoing lists are found also in E.

2. LANGUAGE OF E.

OLD WORDS.

(1) **הבה*** see V., p. 176, Lang. of J (יהב). (2) **הוא** Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (3) **שים** Sect. 13, Lang. of J. (4) **קרא** (happen) Sect. 11, Lang. of J. (5) **פרץ** Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (6) **כרוע** Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (7) **טרם** V., p. 155, Lang. of J. (8) **הרה** V., p. 155, Lang. of J. (9) **חמר** verb Ex. 2:3 E, all in Hex; noun, Gen. 11:3 J (Dill. J); 14:10 special source (Dill. E), Ex. 2:3 E; all in Hex, (10) **ילר** also in J, Gen. 32:23; 33:1-14; 44:20. (11) **יאר** also in J, Ex. 4:9; 7:25,28; 8:5,7; in P, 7:19; 8:1. (12) **אמה** Sect. 6, Lang. of E, referred by rule to E. (13) **גרל** Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (14) **טמן** Sect. 9, Lang. of E (also in J). (15) **אכן** Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (16) **אנכי** Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (17) **עתה** V., p. 155 in J. (18) **נא** Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (19) **נתן** (permit) Sect. 6, Lang. of E (also in J). (20) **פן** V., p. 155, in J. (21) **לבנים** Gen. 11:3 J (Dill. J); Ex. 1:14 P (this word cut out solely on account of its evident allusion to ch. 5); 5:7,8,16,18,19 J (Well.), E (Dill.). (22) **פנע** Sect. 8, Lang. of E (also in P). (23) **תמול שלשם** Sect. 13, Lang. of J. (24) **על-כן** Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (25) **אין** Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (26) **נם....** Sect. 12, Lang. of J. (27) **לקראת** Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (28) **הביט** Sect. 5, Lang. of J. (29) **הלם** Gen. 16:13 J; Ex. 3:5 J (Well.), E (Dill.); all in Hex. (30) **פוש** Gen. 32:18 E; 33:8 J; Ex. 4:24,27 J (Dill. and Well.); all in Hex. (31) **פויץ** Gen. 10:18; 49:7; Num. 10:35 J; Gen. 11:4,8,9 J (Dill. J); Ex. 5:12 J (Well.), E (Dill.); all in Hex. except three times in Deuteronomy. (32) **עברך** Sect. 6, Lang. of J.

NEW WORDS.

(1) **מילרת** Gen. 35:17; Ex. 1:15-21 E; Gen. 38:28 J; all in O. T. (2) **צפן** Ex. 2:2,3 E; Josh. 2:4 uncertain whether J or E (Dill.); all in Hex. (3) **חרב** Ex. 3:1 J (Well.), E (Dill.); 17:6 E (Dill.), uncertain; (Well.) 33:6 E, and repeatedly in Deuteronomy; **סיני** is commonly referred

to P or J, but occurs in E, Ex. 19:11,18 (where Dill. says it was introduced by R from J), Deut. 33:2. Sinai is the name of the particular peak from which the law was given, Horeb a more general term for the whole cluster of mountains. While Israel lay encamped at its base, and in reference to laws enacted there it was natural to use the term Sinai; prior to God's descent upon Sinai and subsequently when they were at a distance, in the plains of Moab, as in Deuteronomy, it was equally natural to say Horeb.

(4) **קרה** Ex. 3:2,3,4 J (Well.), E (Dill.); Deut. 33:16 E; all in Hex.

(5) **של נעלך וגו'** Ex. 3:5 J (Well.), E (Dill.); Josh. 5:15 J; all in O. T.

(6) **לחץ** noun Ex. 3:9 J (Well.), E (Dill.); Deut. 26:7; all in Hex; verb, Ex. 3:9 J or E; 22:20; 23:9 E; Num. 22:25 J; all in Hex.

(7) **נפלאות** Ex. 3:20 J (Well.), E (Dill.); 34:10 R; Josh. 3:5 E; all in Hex. [Josh. 5:9 cited VI., p. 34 is probably an inadvertence for Job 5:9.]

(8) **ריקם** Gen. 31:42; Ex. 3:21; 23:15 E; 34:20 J; all in Hex. except twice in Deuteronomy.

(9) **נגש** Ex. 3:7; 5:6,10,13,14 J (Well.), E (Dill.); all in Hex.

(10) **שטר** Ex. 5:6,10,14,15,19 J (Well.), E (Dill.); Num. 11:16 J; all in Hex. except Deuteronomy and passages in Joshua referred to D.

(11) **קשש** Ex. 5:7,12 J (Well.), E (Dill.); Num. 15:32,33 P or a later addition to P; all in Hex.

(12) **באש** Gen. 34:30; Ex. 8:10 J; 7:21 E; 5:21; 7:18 J (Well.), E (Dill.); 16:20,24 P; all in Hex.

RARE WORDS.

These, of course, afford no indication of a writer's ordinary diction.

(1) Nowhere else in Hex., a, **נִמָּא** 2:3; b, **זָפַת** 2:3; c, **סוּף** 2:3,5; d, **משה** 2:10.

(2) Nowhere else in O. T., a, **אֲבוֹנִים** (birth-stool) 1:16; b, **לבת** 3:2; c, **נרפים** Niph. 5:8,17.

It will be seen how total is the failure to establish any characteristic diction for

* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 34.

E; almost every word in the above lists occurs likewise in J. Nearly the entire narrative portion being given to J or E, and only a few insignificant scraps reserved for P, it is to be expected that a large proportion of the words employed will not be found in the latter.

J and E are so indistinguishable in "style," "material" and "theology," that they are considered together in all these respects, *HEBRAICA*, VI., pp. 30, 32, 35. This is an admission that no argument can be thence derived for sundering J from E. The only thing calling for remark is the following summary of "E's special characteristics," *ibid.*, p. 34.

1) "This writer calls Mt. Sinai *Horeb*, 3:1." Explained above under "New Words" (3).

2) "An angel appears unto Moses, 3:2." So also to Hagar, Gen. 16:7-13 J; Lot, 19:1 J; Jacob, 32:24 (cf. Hos. 12:4) J (Well.); Balaam, Num. 22:22-35 J; Joshua, Josh. 5:13-15 (with explicit allusion to Ex. 3:5) J; to which in all fairness should be added Abraham, Gen. 22:11,15, though v. 11 is by the critics referred to E in spite of the name "Jehovah," and v. 15 though admitted to be akin to J in thought and expressions is ascribed to R.

3) "Moses' name is repeated in calling, 3:4." There are but two other instances of such repetition, Gen. 22:11; 46:2, the former of which ought on critical principles to be assigned to J; in other passages in E the name is not repeated, e. g., Gen. 31:11; 22:1,7; 21:17.

4) "Fondness for 'three days' journeys,' 3:18; 5:3." So J, Gen. 30:36; Num. 10:33b, cf. also Josh. 9:16; P, Num. 33:8.

5) "Even after recording the revelation of the name *Yahweh* in 3:15 sq., he continues regularly with אֱלֹהִים in the rest of his narrative, e. g., 4:20,27."* So far is this from being the case that the critics have frequent recourse to R to account for the absence of אֱלֹהִים in E, as is confessed, *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 35, "not even the names of the Deity are to be relied on implicitly, being freely intermingled."

SECTION 14. Ex. 7:8-12:51.

The questions raised by the critics now become grave indeed in their bearing upon the truth and divine origin of the religion of the Old Testament. The details of patriarchal history are less vital than the events which we now approach, which are the credentials of the Mosaic revelation and the divinely given attestation that it is from Him whom all nature obeys and that it is charged with His supreme authority. The formula which declares the source of the Pentateuchal laws and their claim upon Israel's homage and obedience is "I am Jehovah thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the

* Neither Wellhausen, Dillmann, nor Jülicher refer 4:27 to E.

house of bondage." And the fact that they were led forth "with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm and with signs and wonders," is repeatedly appealed to in evidence that it was indeed Jehovah himself, who had wrought their deliverance. If now the record of these events is framed out of divergent and conflicting sources, as the critics claim, their credibility is, to say the least, seriously impaired. But if it is, as has always been believed, a contemporaneous and self-consistent narrative, this carries with it unimpeachable evidence of its truth and accuracy.

In a matter such as this we surely have the right to demand something more than plausible conjecture resting upon slight and dubious grounds. There should be clear and unambiguous proof proportionate to the gravity of the consequences suspended upon it. Can such proof be furnished? Let us see.

1. The Grounds of Partition.

It is alleged that there are such characteristic and pervading differences in the narratives of the plagues as betray a diversity of writers.

1. The miracles are sometimes wrought by Aaron with his rod (P), 7:10,19; 8:1 sq.,12 sq. (A. V., 5 sq.,16 sq.); sometimes by the rod or hand of Moses (E), 7:17 (cf. 14); 9:23; 10:13,22; and sometimes without human instrumentality by the sole and immediate agency of Jehovah himself (J), 7:25,27 (A. V., 8:2); 8:17,20 (A. V., 21,24); 9:3,5 sq.,18,23b; 10:4,13b.

2. The miracles described by P are to be classed as signs rather than inflictions; they are successive trials of strength between Aaron and the magicians of Egypt in which the latter are each time worsted more seriously than before, until finally they are discomfited altogether. These are framed after a uniform pattern: "Jehovah spake unto Moses, Say unto Aaron, Stretch forth thy rod and do so and so that there may be....and they did so (as Jehovah commanded) and Aaron stretched out his rod and did so and so and there was...and the magicians did so with their enchantments and.... But Pharaoh's heart was hardened [or Jehovah hardened Pharaoh's heart] and he hearkened not to them as Jehovah had said." These form a regularly advancing series from the preliminary sign of rods changed to serpents through the first, second, third, and sixth plagues (blood, frogs, lice, boils). But in the remaining plagues (fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth, ninth) there is no allusion to the magicians whatever.

3. Certain of the plagues are announced beforehand (uniformly J). Moses is bidden to go to Pharaoh and demand the release of Israel, at the same time notifying him that if he refused to let them go such and such a plague would be sent, commonly at a specified time; so in the plagues of blood, frogs, flies, murrain, hail and locusts (first, second, fourth, fifth, seventh, eighth (but not the third, sixth, and ninth).

4. In certain of the plagues the effect produced upon the king is expressly

stated (JE); he summons Moses and Aaron and begs them to entreat Jehovah for its removal and makes larger and larger concessions; but, when the plague was over, Pharaoh hardened his heart and would not let the people go. This takes place in the second, fourth, seventh, eighth and ninth plagues (frogs, flies, hail, locusts, darkness) but not in the third, fifth, and sixth.

Hence it is argued that the plagues not being regarded from the same point of view, nor described in the same manner, nor forming a continuous series in any of the respects named above, cannot all have been recorded by the same hand. Different accounts have been mingled together; but when these are disentangled and restored each to its proper separate form, the regular and orderly arrangement which is now confused will be brought to light.

In addition to the rod changed to a serpent the critics find the following plagues in

P (1) blood, (2) frogs, (3) lice, (6) boils.

J (1) blood, (2) frogs, (4) flies, (5) murrain, (7) hail, (8) locusts.

E (1) blood, (7) hail, (8) locusts, (9) darkness, with possible traces of two others, perhaps frogs and flies.

In reality, however, the plagues form a symmetrical and regularly unfolding scheme, as they stand in the record, without any confusion or derangement. The first nine plagues spontaneously divide themselves into three series of three each.

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. (1) blood, 7:14-25. | (4) flies, 8:16-28. | (7) hail, 9:13-35. |
| 2. (2) frogs, 7:26-8:11.* | (5) murrain, 9:1-7. | (8) locusts, 10:1-20. |
| 3. (3) lice, 8:12-15. | (6) boils, 9:8-12. | (9) darkness, 10:21-27. |

In each series the first and second are announced beforehand; the third is sent without warning. The regularly repeated formula in the first is with slight variations: "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Rise up early in the morning and stand before Pharaoh,—lo! he cometh forth to the water,—and say unto him, Thus saith Jehovah (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou wilt not let my people go, behold I"... .

The second of each series is introduced thus: "And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh and say unto him, Thus saith Jehovah (the God of the Hebrews), Let my people go that they may serve me; and if thou refuse to let them go, behold I"†....

While the first in each series was thus pre-announced to the king by the river's side, and the second in his palace, the third was wrought without premonition, Jehovah simply giving direction to Moses or to Moses and Aaron.

This orderly arrangement of the plagues is rendered still more significant by their number, which cannot be merely the accidental result of combining separate

* In A. V., 8:1-15, with a corresponding change in the verses throughout ch. 8.

† These recurring formulae would be called "stereotyped" and "repetitious," if they were found in P:

accounts, which differ both in the number of the plagues and in the substance of the plagues themselves. Nine follow in immediate succession, three times three, suggestive of the three degrees of comparison, each series rising to a climax, the final series the climax of all that preceded; and these are but the prelude to the tenth, which seals the completeness of the whole, like the ten digits and the ten commandments.

And not only in numerical structure but in intrinsic character the plagues proceed by regular gradation, growing in their intensity and severity from first to last. The water of the river, which was adored as divine, the source of Egypt's fertility, became so offensive, that the fish in it died and men could no longer drink of it. It next poured forth multitudes of disgusting vermin, frogs covering the land, filling the houses and the very bedchambers and beds of both king and people. Then the ground was smitten and its dust was alive with troublesome insects, lice (or fleas) upon man and beast. The insect pest was next intensified, swarms of stinging flies, abounding everywhere. Then a fatal pestilence attacking cattle, followed by boils and painful eruptions on the persons of men. To this succeed widespread destruction by an unheard of storm of hail with thunder and lightning, the still more extreme desolation by locusts, the awful darkness paralyzing all and filling all with terror, the precursor of the last, most terrible and crushing blow, the death of all the first-born throughout the land of Egypt from the palace to the dungeon.

A similar progress is observable in the specific aim of the several plagues, their range, and their attendant circumstances. In the first series the Egyptian magicians vie with Aaron, as they had done in the preliminary sign exhibited before Pharaoh of a rod turned into a serpent, 7:9-12. This is not a duplicate account of the miracle in the wilderness of Horeb, 4:2-4,* intended as a sign wherewith Moses might convince the people, and afterwards wrought in their presence by Aaron as his representative, 4:30. This is a like sign wrought on a separate occasion by special divine direction for Pharaoh's conviction. His serpent charmers imitate it, but Aaron's rod swallowed up theirs. The first two plagues they also imitated, but appeal had to be made to Moses and Aaron for the removal of the second. In the third they altogether failed and confessed, "This is the finger of God." This ends the contest with the magicians. They make no further effort to repeat any of the miracles and are only mentioned once again in the plague inflicted upon persons. They are stricken like the rest.

* "Serpent" in 4:3 is נחש, but in 7:9-12 תנין. This has been thought to indicate different writers. But נחש and תנין both occur in the same verse and in application to the same object, Isa. 27:1; and תנין is used in this same sense, Deut. 32:33; Ps. 91:13. תנין as the more comprehensive word is sometimes used generally of such reptiles as infest the water, and it may be suggestive of larger size. But in the passages now in question the words seem to be used as equivalents, which need create no more surprise than if a writer should use "serpent" in one passage and "snake" in another.

With the second series of plagues begins their explicit limitation to the Egyptians in contrast with the land of Goshen where Israel dwelt. The protection of Israel is expressly remarked in every plague from the fourth to the tenth, except two, viz., boils and locusts; and in these it is distinctly implied in their being specifically sent upon the Egyptians and the land of Egypt.

Once in the first series of plagues, once again in the second, and at each successive plague of the third series, Pharaoh sent with increasing urgency to Moses and Aaron to solicit their intercession on his behalf. He first promises to let the people go and asks to have the frogs taken away to-morrow. When flies are sent, he offers with more definiteness to let the people sacrifice in the land or to go into the wilderness for the purpose, if they do not go very far away. The hail wrings from him the confession I have sinned; I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer. When he is threatened with locusts, Pharaoh's servants urge him to yield, and he proposes to let the men go but not the children. When they are actually sent, he calls in haste for Moses and Aaron, confesses his sin and begs to be forgiven only this once. In the plague of darkness he permits them to take their children but not their cattle. In the consternation at the death of the first-born he concedes everything; they may take their cattle too.

The first series is uniformly wrought by the rod of Aaron, and the third with equal uniformity by the rod of Moses.* In the second series no rod is mentioned. The first two plagues of this series are simply announced by Moses. In conformity with the scheme upon which all the plagues are conducted, the third is not preannounced. It is linked with Moses by his being concerned in its production; it follows upon his act, not as those before it upon his word.

But here we are met by the question, Does the agency respectively attributed to Moses and to Aaron in their dealings with Pharaoh correspond with that which is outlined for them in 7:2? If to justify their partition of the text the critics infer from this verse that according to P, Aaron, not Moses, is to speak before Pharaoh, they gain nothing by it; for P does not, in all that they assign to him, record a single address to Pharaoh by either of the brothers from this verse forward.

It is plain, however, upon the face of this passage that Aaron is not to supersede or displace Moses. Moses was from the first the chosen organ of divine communication, and he holds throughout the superior rank, as 7:1 distinctly affirms. Aaron is simply called in as his assistant and coadjutor. Moses is to speak all that God commands him. Aaron is to aid him before Pharaoh. In conformity with this Jehovah directs Moses to speak to Pharaoh, 7:14, etc., etc. But Aaron uniformly accompanies him, and unites in the delivery of the message, 10:3, which is further implied in the repeated phrase, "Pharaoh hearkened not unto

* Stretching forth his hand toward heaven, 10:22, is equivalent to stretching forth his rod, as is apparent from the comparison of 9:22 with v. 23 and 10:12 with v. 13.

them," 7:13,22, etc. He works the miracles, by which it is enforced, to the end of the first series of plagues;* all after this are wrought by Moses. Pharaoh pressed by necessity invariably summons both Moses and Aaron and asks their intercession; but as Moses is the organ of communication with God, it is invariably he alone who intercedes. The critics, who wish to establish a distinction between P and J in regard to Aaron, are puzzled to account for his presence at all in the interviews with the king, which they assign to J. But if his name was inserted by R, to enhance the credit of the future high priest, why did he not make him the intercessor with God and give him altogether a more conspicuous part in the narrative?

The evidences of unity, that have now been recited, growing out of the structural arrangement of the plagues, and the various indications of one consistent plan ruling in the whole, cannot be easily set aside and certainly cannot be accidental.

Scarcely any account is made of diction in dividing this section; and as it would appear, with good reason, for what is urged is meagre enough. P uses the term "wonders," 7:3,9; 11:9,10, (but so does E, 4:21); and "pool," 7:19, which occurs but twice besides in the whole Pentateuch. "Magicians," though in Genesis used by E, is here ascribed to P. Three words are employed to denote the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, which vary slightly in signification, קשה hard or obdurate, חזק stout or obstinate, כבד heavy, hard to move or stubborn. These are used in both intransitive and transitive forms, and the latter with Jehovah or Pharaoh himself as subjects. It is alleged that J always uses כבד, yet he interchanges the adjectives כבד and חזק, 10:14,19; P and E alike make use of חזק and that in both its transitive and intransitive forms, a result reached in disregard of the critical dictum that E uses אלהים and not יהוה;† P also uses קשה, which occurs but once in this connection. כבד and חזק both occur after the plague of hail, 9:34,35, the former transitive attributing the hardening to Pharaoh's own agency, the latter intransitive. Instead of admitting that J has here used both words, the critics isolate v. 35 from its context and attach it elsewhere. The same is done with 10:20, which though in a J connection is referred to E notwithstanding יהוה, because it has חזק.

It is said that the P formula is "Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he hearkened not unto them, as Jehovah had said;" while that of JE is "Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he would not let the people go." Yet P has the latter phrase, 11:10; cf. also 6:11; 7:2. "Thou has not hearkened hitherto," 7:16 J, is a plain allusion to P's phrase just before, v. 13. In 8:11 (A. V. 15) J's phrase

* Aaron is not the only miracle worker in P, according to the critics themselves. It was Moses who wrought the plague of boils, 9:10, and divided the Red Sea, 14:16,21; cf. 11:10 P.

† HEBRAICA, VI., p. 47. "In this section the name of the Deity is *exclusively* יהוה, which must have been substituted by R in all the passages; or else even E uses this name in this section, on the strength of 3:15, where Yahweh is revealed."

כָּבַד for the hardening of the heart and P's "hearkened not unto them" occur together, but instead of drawing the natural conclusion that one writer uses both expressions the critics split the sentence and divide it between J and P. If, as we are told, R has here erased חִזַּק, P's word for "hardened," as superfluous after כָּבַד J, why did he allow both to remain, 9:34,35? In 9:35, moreover, E has a part of P's phrase "as Jehovah had said," which Jülicher finds it convenient to attribute to R. Where the presence of the magicians is noted, obstructing attention to the demand of Moses and Aaron, it was natural to say "Pharaoh hearkened not unto them;" everywhere else the statement is "he would not let the people go."

2. The Plague of Blood 7:14-25.

According to Knobel and Schrader P's account of this plague is found in 7:19-22. But if that be so, one of the discrepancies insisted upon between P and JE ceases to exist. It is said that P represents all the water in the land of Egypt as turned to blood, while JE limits this to the water of the river. But while v. 19 speaks of streams and rivers and ponds and pools and even the water in wood and stone as converted into blood, v. 20 lays stress only upon the water of the river, and v. 21 speaks of the fish dying in the river and the impossibility of drinking of the water of the river. Nöldeke and Kayser, therefore, assign these last two verses, which occur in the midst of P's statement, to JE, with the exception of the first clause of v. 20, "And Moses and Aaron did so as Jehovah commanded." Dillmann and Wellhausen do the same, only they except in addition the last clause of v. 21, "And there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt."

The further attempt to separate J from E leads to the splitting up of this entire paragraph into minute fragments. In the first place it becomes a question whether on critical principles J can be assigned any part here whatever, for he had already spoken, 4:9, of the change of water to blood in a different connection and for a different purpose, not as an infliction upon Egypt, but as a sign to convince the children of Israel. And there is quite as much reason for regarding that as a divergent account by J of the transaction here recorded, as there is for a similar allegation respecting 4:2-4 J and 7:8-12 P. But critics must be allowed to draw different conclusions from identical premises, when it suits their convenience.

7:14 is given to J because of כָּבַד. But 15b cannot be from J, who knows nothing of miracles wrought with a rod, nor from E who knows nothing of a rod turned into a serpent. This combined reference to 4:17 E and 4:3 J would seem to show that those verses cannot be sundered, as is done by the critics. They have, however, one refuge in every perplexity; this clause must have been inserted by R. If that is the case it is clear that in the judgment of R the rod which was turned to a serpent, 4:3, is the rod which Moses was to take in his

hand wherewith to do signs, 4:17, the critics to the contrary notwithstanding. And furthermore in the intent of the author of this paragraph in its present form the rod aforesaid is the one with which this miracle was wrought; it is identical, therefore, with the rod used by Aaron, v. 19.

Still further, v. 16 J is a plain reference to 3:18; 5:3, which are assigned by Dillmann to E; he is consequently obliged to assume that J has here made use of E. Verse 17a "In this thou shalt know that I am Jehovah," is by Jülicher attributed to Rj, who gives this religious aim to the miracle. The sudden change of speaker in v. 17 is particularly urged in proof that there is a confusion in the text arising from the blending of two distinct sources. "I will smite with the rod" is plainly the language of Moses, and yet it is prefaced with "Thus saith Jehovah." Such a transition from the words of God to those of his human messenger is, however, of too frequent occurrence to create surprise, cf. Isa. 48:16; Zech. 2:11; 4:8,9. According to the critics, vs. 14-17 as far as the words, "Behold, I . . ." or "I will smite" . . . belong (with the exceptions already noted) to J, who attributes the plagues to the immediate agency of Jehovah. The remainder of v. 17 and perhaps v. 18 belong to E, who always employs the instrumentality of Moses' rod. E's account recommences v. 20 with the words, "And he (the pronoun is by the critics referred to Moses) lifted up the rod," etc., and continues in v. 21 as far as "water of the river," and finally embraces v. 24. Then v. 25, which speaks of Jehovah smiting the river is the conclusion of J's account. About v. 23 there is some perplexity. Wellhausen assigns it to P, Dillmann to E, Jülicher to J. "And this also he did not lay to heart," i. e., this miracle like the one before it failed to influence him, is an evident allusion to 7:9-12 P, whereas "Pharaoh turned and went into his house," refers back to his going out in the morning, v. 15 J (according to Dillmann on the basis of E). Here is again a combined reference to two passages sundered by the critics, which on their principles admits of no explanation. Hence their uncertainty what to do with it.

And now all this sundering and recombining simply makes a confused jumble of the whole matter.

1. The message to Pharaoh, vs. 14-18, the direction to Aaron to execute what had been announced to Pharaoh, v. 19, and his doing as he was directed, v. 20, belong together and are necessary to complete one another. They cannot be assigned to different writers without making each part a disconnected fragment. According to the critics' division J gives no account of the infliction of the plague; E's portion begins in the middle of a sentence, with no intimation who is speaking or to whom the words are addressed; P states in general, v. 20a, that Moses and Aaron did as they were commanded, but according to the analogy of 8:2,13 (A. V. 6,17) this should be followed by the specific act performed and its result,—precisely what in fact does follow in the rest of the verse but is by the critics ascribed to a different document.

2. The close verbal correspondence between vs. 17b,18 and 20b,21a, and the correspondence again between v. 19 and 8:1 (A. V. 5) is no argument for the critical division, for it is at once explained if all is from the same writer. The assumption that the double application of the pronoun "I" in v. 17 is due to R's confusing separate sentences imputes a degree of carelessness or stupidity to him that is quite inconceivable. And the mention of the rod, so far from being out of place or requiring the assumption of a different writer is just what v. 15 prepares us to expect.

3. There is no inconsistency in Moses speaking of smiting the waters, when in fact they were smitten by Aaron at his bidding. Moses simply acts through the instrumentality of Aaron. Nor is there any want of agreement between the command "Take thy rod and stretch out thine hand upon the waters" and the consequent action "he lifted up the rod and smote the waters." Stretching out the rod and smiting with the rod are similarly combined 8:12,13 (A. V. 16,17), only there both terms are inserted in each clause, while here the two clauses supplement each other. Nor is there any discrepancy in all the waters of Egypt becoming blood, whereas Moses had simply spoken to Pharaoh of the water of the river. This was singled out as the most conspicuous and important; and so again in recording the fulfilment, which yet proceeds to add that there was blood throughout all the land of Egypt. And the suggestion that Jehovah's smiting the river involves a different conception from its waters being changed to blood when smitten by divine direction refutes itself.

The space allotted to this article will not permit a like detailed examination of the remaining plagues. Wellhausen admits the impossibility of separating J from E in the plague of blood, frogs, hail and locusts. He would certainly have added that of flies, if he could have anticipated the hair-splitting analysis, which Dillmann struggles to carry through. And as these are the only ones, in which both these documents are supposed to enter, this is equivalent to a surrender of the whole case. The division which is attempted, rests not upon criteria of diction such as are held to distinguish the documents elsewhere, but solely upon distinctions arbitrarily assumed and which are relentlessly forced through in the manner already sufficiently illustrated.

3. Style, Material and Theology.

Such particulars as are grouped under these heads, HEBRAICA, VI., pp. 37sq., may now be considered, so far as they appear to call for remark and have not been answered already.

"P is systematic," precisely as the entire scheme of plagues is systematic, as has been fully shown.

When in P, Aaron is to "stretch his hand over the waters of Egypt, over their rivers, over their streams, over their pools, and over all their ponds," and

particulars are given in other cases, this is called "minute, exact," *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 30. But when J says, the frogs shall "come into thine house and into thy bed-chamber and upon thy bed and into thine ovens and into thy kneading troughs," and like specifications are given regarding the flies, or the cattle that suffer from the murrain, this is called "vivid," p. 44.

If P is "minute, exact" when stating the duration of "Israel's stay in Egypt," so JE, seven days plague of blood, 7:25; three days darkness, 10:22,23; time defined "tomorrow," 8:6,19 (A. V. 10,23), 9:5,6,18; about midnight, 11:4; exact condition of the several crops, 9:31,32.

P is "stereotyped," so JE שלח את עמי ועבדני (six times), 7:16,26; 8:16 (A. V., 8:1,20); 9:1,13; 10:3. יהוה אלהי העברים (six times), 3;8; (5:3); 7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3. שלח אתה מאן אם (three times), 7:27 (A. V., 8:2); 9:2; 10:4; cf. 4:23; 7:14; 8:17. ויקרא פרעה למשה ולאהרן ויאמר העתירו אל יהוה ולא שלח 8:28 (A. V., 32); 9:7,35; 10:20,(27); (11:10 P).

P is "verbose and repetitious;" so is JE, if the same standard and method of treatment be applied. 7:18b is repeated vs. 21,24; 7:29 (A. V., 8:4) adds nothing to v. 28; 8:7(11) is unnecessary after vs. 5,6(9,10); v. 9b(13b) is unnecessary after 9a(13a); v. 17(21) is needlessly amplified; v. 19a(23a) is needless after 18(22); the opening words are all that are needed in v. 20(24); v. 22(26) might have been expressed more briefly; v. 25(29) is needlessly amplified; the opening clause is all that is needed in v. 27(31). We might go similarly through the rest of the chapters if it was worth while.

The mode of inferring "duplicates" is peculiar. Unless there is fresh mention at every step of all that had gone before, it is assumed that the writer knew nothing of it. "(1) 7:9 starts out *as if there never had been any thought* of showing wonders to Pharaoh; yet 4:21, etc. (2) The 'rod turning serpent' appears here *as something entirely original*, a representation which could hardly have been made by the writer of 4:3. (3) 7:19 has the air of a *perfectly new order* about the plague of blood, not appearing as if it had just been mentioned in v. 17." The words italicized above are entirely gratuitous, and not suggested by anything in the text itself. The writer surely could trust his readers to remember what he had said shortly before. It might as well be said of 7:20b that lifting up the rod and smiting the waters has the air of a perfectly new act never thought of before and it does not appear as if it had been announced, v. 17.

The want of connection alleged (4) between v. 19, all the waters and v. 20 the river *only* is created by inserting "only" which is not in the text and is annulled by "(5) 21b is a clumsy addition." Very clumsy in critical estimation because it overturns the false interpretation put upon the preceding, as though it limited the miracle to the river.

"(6) Verse 23 is a repetition of 22b, such as is not found elsewhere after the

same or similar formula." But it is found here and is a *cruz criticorum* as has been shown before.

"(7) 8:1-3 does not seem to imply 7:26-29,"* the same fallacy as in Nos. 1-3; "and it does not go with 8:4." But though the magicians might aggravate the plague, they could not remove it. There was every reason, therefore, why the prayers of Moses and Aaron should be asked for.

(8) Seven plagues "have warnings, while three come without any notice." This grows out of the symmetrical plan, exhibited above.

"Differences." (1) In JE "Moses is to perform the wonders before Pharaoh *without waiting for Pharaoh to ask for them*, 4:21; in P Aaron is to do them, at the request of Pharaoh, 7:9." Eliminate the italicized words, which are not in the text, and remember that Aaron was appointed to be Moses' helper, and where is the discrepancy? (2) תנין and נחש: this is explained above. (3) and (4) P every collection of water, J and E the Nile; explained above. (5) Magicians in but four of the ten plagues; explained above.

"Inconsistencies." (1) "Some of the differences mentioned above amount to incongruities." It has been shown that this is not the case. (2) "11:9 says 'that my wonders may be multiplied,'" while 11:1 says "yet one more plague will I bring." But that plague was multitudinous; there was a death in every household. And to add one more was to increase the number and thus make them more numerous. Apart from this, however, the whole apparent force of the objection lies in the tacit assumption that a sequence in the order of the record must necessarily indicate chronological succession. 11:9,10 do not in the order of time follow the foregoing, but are a summation of all that has preceded. This is obvious in v. 10. It is equally true of v. 9.

"R's free arrangement." Several suggestions are made under this head of an improved order of the verses. This is purely a matter of taste and may be left to be settled between R and the critics.

In P "God's revelation is formal and stiffly sublime: (1) He orders Moses and Aaron to do a certain thing and 'they did so.'" But the orders in JE, 9:22, 23; 10:12,13,21,22 are precisely parallel to those in P, 7:19; 8:1,2,12,13 (A. V. 5, 6,16,17). (2) "His orders are usually the simple fiat 'let it become a serpent'" etc., but precisely so JE, 9:22, "let there be hail;" 10:21, "let there be darkness." "(3) He does according to his will, without warning Pharaoh of his plans." Exactly so E, 10:21 sqq.

"(1) No miracle is shown, except when Pharaoh demands one, 7:9." A sign is provided in advance for convincing Pharaoh, 7:9 P, precisely as for convincing Israel, 4:1sqq. J. "(2) Each succeeding plague comes only because the preceding

* The massoretic punctuation of בַּפְּרָדִים 7:27 does not annul the fact that the article ה does not appear with צִפְרִדִּים when first mentioned in the announcement to Pharaoh, but it is made definite both by ה and אֵת in the direction to Aaron.

one did not touch Pharaoh's heart." Exactly so in JE. "It is only after the last plague (of boils) that Yahweh hardens the king's heart, and for that there is no punishment as in the prophetic story." Even as the critics parcel the plagues, was the death of the firstborn no punishment? And was the overthrow in the Red Sea no punishment, 14:4,8 P? "(3) It would seem that God did this in order that the exodus might be due directly to his intervention and not to Pharaoh's subjection." There is no difference here between P and JE. It was God's mighty hand that led Israel out in one as in the other. P speaks of the plague of the first-born, but says nothing of any hardening of Pharaoh's heart in connection with it as invariably with the other plagues. The implication is that this broke his obstinacy for the time, until Israel was some distance on their way, when he recovered himself sufficiently to pursue them.

"God is remote from man : (1) he enters into no negotiations with Pharaoh. (2) On the other hand he does not torment or vex Pharaoh [whatever this may mean] as in the representation of J." This is wholly due to the critical partition. That part of the record, which is assigned to J, is of course not left for P.

"The importance of Aaron is emphasized : (1) Aaron is invariably associated with Moses;" so in JE, 8:4,8,21 (A. V., 8,12,25); 9:27; 10:3,8,16. "And in all the plagues but one (the last) Aaron does the work." In the first series of plagues he acts by Moses' direction; in the remaining series Moses acts for himself. "(2) Even in receiving the divine orders, Aaron is mentioned in the first two, 6:13; 7:8, and in the last two, 9:8; 12:1." Nevertheless in P as in JE, God commonly speaks to Moses, 6:2,10; 7:1,2, etc., etc.

It seems unnecessary to pursue these details further, the bare statement of which suggests the answer. But it would be unpardonable not to notice the egregious misrepresentations on p. 48; I beg pardon, but I can call them by no milder name. "Yahweh encourages stealing (at least plundering) goods of the Egyptians, which are to be gotten only by lying, 11:2sq." The only seeming plausibility in this gross misstatement arises from the erroneous translation of a Hebrew word. The people were not bidden to "borrow" nor did the Egyptians "lend," 12:35,36, with any expectation or implication of the things being returned. They asked and the Egyptians bestowed. The Lord gave his people favor in the sight of the Egyptians, who were, moreover, in too great terror to refuse. They were urgent upon the Israelites to send them out of the land in haste and were only too glad to be rid of them at any price, since their detention by the king had been followed by such awful scourges. There was thus no deception in the case, and the transaction was legitimate from a triple point of view; the right of divine gift, the Sovereign Proprietor and Lord of all could justly dispose of the wealth of Egypt as he saw fit; the right of conquest, Israel was victorious in the struggle with Egypt and was in a position to dictate their own terms; the right of compensation for unrequited service which they had rendered and oppressive bondage which they had endured.

"Moreover, the asking for a three days' journey only, 8:23, was under the circumstances not an honest request." If one, who had a rightful claim and the power to enforce it, should in the first instance ask for a mere fraction of what was due him, in order to try the temper of the party with whom he was dealing, what suspicion of dishonesty would there be in such a course? It was with the view of setting the unreasonable obstinacy of Pharaoh in the most glaring light that so trifling a concession was asked. It was no stratagem for the sake of gaining an advantage. Jehovah had the power to set his people free and he meant to use it. He could just as easily have declared to Pharaoh his whole purpose at the beginning. But the despicable nature of the Egyptian tyrant, and the pitiless bondage to which Israel was subjected, would not have been so clearly exhibited.

"The necessity of indicating the Hebrew houses by blood upon the door-post is hardly compatible with the idea of an omniscient Deity." It is difficult to repress one's indignation at the irreverence of such suggestions. The blood on the door-posts was not to aid God's omniscience, but to teach the need of atonement, to impress upon Israel that they too were exposed to death and must be delivered by the shedding of blood. It is the doctrine incessantly set forth in the whole sacrificial ritual, proclaiming the holiness and the pardoning mercy of God, but impairing none of his infinite perfections.

4. Chapter 12.

I must here be permitted to refer to the detailed discussion of the unity of this chapter in my Hebrew Feasts, Lectures 3 and 4, to which I have nothing material to add, and which there is not now space to repeat.

1. LANGUAGE OF P.*

OLD WORDS.

(1) תָּנִין (= נָחַשׁ in JE, as explained above), V., p. 151 (also in J). (2) מִקּוֹה V., p. 151, only three times in Hex. (3) נֶפֶשׁ (= person) VI., p. 117 (also in J). (4) זָכַר Sect. 5, Lang. of P (also in J). (5) נָתַן (= שָׁם) V., p. 152 (also in J and E). (6) לָדַרַת Sect. 5, Lang. of P (legal phrase). (7) וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ Sect. 5, Lang. of P (legal phrase). (8) בַּעֲצֵם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה V., p. 174 (7:13). (9) בָּן נָכַר Sect. 5, Lang. of P (also in J and E). (10) מִקֵּנַת כֶּסֶף Sect. 5, Lang. of P (legal phrase). (11) מוֹל Sect. 5, Lang. of P (also in J and E). (12) יְהוּה.

NEW WORDS.

All of these (except No. 1) and several of the preceding are legal phrases and not to be looked for in any but a ritual connection.

(1) שָׁחִין in but two passages in P, Ex. 9:9,10 11; Lev. 13:18,19,20,23, and one in Deuteronomy viz.: 28:27,35; all in Hex. (2) עֵרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל (with or without בְּנִי legal phrase. (3) כֶּסֶם Ex. 12:4 P, all in O. T.; מִכְסָּה Ex. 12:4; Lev. 27:23 P, all in O. T.; a cognate word כֶּסֶם is found in a single passage, Num. 31:28,37,38,39,40,41 said by Dill. and Well. not to be by P, but a late addition. (4) מִשְׁמֶרֶת legal phrase; in Gen. 26:5 referred to R in a J connection. (5) בֵּין הָעֲרֵבִים legal phrase. (6) חֻקַּת עוֹלָם legal phrase. (7) מִקְרָא קָרָשׁ legal phrase. (8) אַחֲזָה legal phrase.

WORDS USED IN ONE PASSAGE ONLY.

These, of course, afford no indication of a writer's style.

(a) לָטִים (or לְהָטִים) 7:11,22; 8:3,14. (b) פִּיחַ 9:8,10. (c) אֲבַעְבַּעַת 9:9,10.

* The numbers are those of HEBRAICA, VI., pp. 36,37.

2. LANGUAGE OF J.*

It will be observed that almost every word here classed as belonging to J occurs likewise in E, so that they are indistinguishable in diction.

OLD WORDS.

(1) מֵאֵן Sect. 10, Lang. of E. (2) יְהוּה (also in E). (3) לִקְרֹאת Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E, once P). (4) מִטָּה Sect. 12, Lang. of J (only four times in Hex.; twice J, twice cut out of an E and P context and ascribed to J). (5) עֵתֶר Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (6) צֶעֶק Sect. 2, Lang. of J (also E). (7) עַל דֶּבֶר Gen. 12:17; 43:18; Ex. 8:8 J; Gen. 20:11 E; Num. 17:14; 25:18 *bis* P; Gen. 20:18; Num. 31:16 R; Deut. 22:24 *bis*; 23:5 D; all in Hex. (8) שֵׁם V.. p. 154 (also in P and E). (9) בָּאֵשׁ Sect. 13, Lang. of E. (10) הַשֶּׁכֶם Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also E). (11) רֶקֶק Sect. 3, Lang. of J (also E). (12) יָכַף Sect. 2, Lang. of J (also E). (13) פָּנִים V., p. 155 (Josh. 6:16a E). (14) מִקְנֵה Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E and P). (15) אֲנֹכִי Sect. 5, Lang. of J (also E, once P). (16) חֹדֶל Sect. 10, Lang. of E (once P). (17) טָרַם V., p. 156 (also E, once P). (18) מָחָר Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also E). (19) נָשָׂא (= forgive) Sect. 6, Lang. of J (also E). (20) נָא Sect. 12, Lang. of E. (21) הַשְׁמֹר לָךְ Sect. 7, Lang. of J (also E). (22) נָתַן לְ (= permit) Sect. 6, Lang. of E. (23) קָרַר Sect. 7, Lang. of J. (24) גֵּרַשׁ V. p. 154 (also E and P). (25) הַתְּמַהֲמָה Sect. 11, Lang. of J (only three times in Hex.). (26) הַיָּאֵר (= Nile) Sect. 13, Lang. of E. (27) עֹזֵב Sect. 13, Lang. of J (also E). (28) חֹרֵר Gen. 43:30; Ex. 7:28 J; Deut. 32:25 poem inserted by J

but not composed by him; all in Hex. (29) אֲרִמָּה V.. p. 153 (also P and E). (30) צָבַר Ex. 8:10 J; Gen. 41:35,49 cut out of E connection and assigned to J; all in Hex. (31) תָּלַל Gen. 31:7 E; Ex. 8:25b J (Well.) E (Dill.); all in Hex.

NEW WORDS.

(1) נָגַף Ex. 7:27; 12:23 *bis*, 27; Lev. 26:17; Num. 14:42 J; Ex. 21:22,35 E; Josh. 24:5 cut out from E context and referred to J purely on account of this word; Ex. 32:35 R; all in Hex. except three times in Deuteronomy. (2) מִשְׁאֵרֶת Ex. 7:28; 12:34 J; all in Hex. except twice in Deuteronomy. (3) פָּלַה Ex. 8:18; 9:4; 11:7; 33:16 J; all in Hex. (4) יָסַד Ex. 9:18; Josh. 6:26 J; all in Hex. (5) כִּסָּה עֵינֵי הָאָרֶץ Ex. 10:5,15 J; Num. 22:5, 11 E; all in Hex. (6) חָרַץ לְשׁוֹן Ex. 11:7 J; Josh. 10:21 E; all in Hex. (7) חָרַי אָף Ex. 11:8 J; all in Hex. except once in Deuteronomy.

WORDS FOUND NOWHERE ELSE IN THE HEXATEUCH.

These, of course, are destitute of all significance.

(1) רִוּחָה Ex. 8:11. (2) יָעַרְבַּב Ex. 8:17 *bis*, 18, 20 *bis*, 25, 27. (3) פְּרוֹת Ex. 8:19. (4) סָלַל Ex. 9:17. (5) עוּה Hiph. Ex. 9:19. (6) סָף Ex. 12:22. (7) פָּסַח verb Ex. 12:23,27 J; 12:13 P.

3. LANGUAGE OF E†

Every one of these words, that occurs in the Hex. more than once, is to be found likewise in J.

OLD WORDS.

(1) הַיָּאֵר (= Nile) Lang. of J just preceding. (2) בָּאֵשׁ Lang. of J just preceding. (3) לֵאמֹר Sect. 6, Lang. of J. (4) שָׁתַּי Sect. 8, Lang. of J. (5) חֹפֶר Sect. 6, Lang. of E (also J). (6) רֶקֶק Lang. of J just preceding. (7) חֹדֶל Lang. of J just preceding. (8) טָף Sect. 11, Lang. of J. (9) נָא Lang. of J just preceding. (10) בִּקֵּשׁ Sect. 10, Lang. of E (also J). (11) גֵּרַשׁ Lang. of J just preceding. (12) קָרַם Sect. 10, Lang. of

E (also J). (13) גַּם + personal pronoun Sect. 6, Lang. of E (also J and P).

NEW WORDS.

(1) מִתְלַקַּחַת Ex. 9:24; all in Hex. (2) פִּשְׁתָּהּ Ex. 9:31 *bis*; all in Hex. (3) גִּבְעֵל Ex. 9:31; all in Hex. (4) נָתַךְ Ex. 9:33 J; nowhere else. (5) אִפְלִיל Ex. 9:32; nowhere else. אִפְלִיל Ex. 10:22; all in Hex. except once in Deuteronomy. (6) גָּבַר Ex. 10:11; 12:37 E; Num. 24:3,15; Josh. 7:14,17,18 J; all in Hex. except once in Deuteronomy.

* The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., pp. 42,43.

† The numbers are those of *HEBRAICA*, VI., p. 47.